DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 325 IR 057 124

AUTHOR	Soete, George J.
TITLE	Evaluating Academic Library Directors. SPEC Kit 229 and SPEC Flyer 229.
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, DC.
ISSN	ISSN-0160-3582; ISSN-0160-3574
PUB DATE	1998-05-00
NOTE	95p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ARL Publications, Department #0692, Washington, DC 20073-0692.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; Employment Practices; Evaluation Methods; Feedback; Higher Education; *Job Performance; Leadership; *Library Administration; *Library Administrators; *Library Directors; *Library Surveys; Program Development

ABSTRACT

This SPEC Kit and Flyer focus on performance evaluation of library directors. The survey, included in the SPEC Kit, was sent to all 121 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) directors; 76 directors (63%) responded. The survey asked about factual attributes of director review processes, including frequency of review cycles, participants, and outcomes, as well as about satisfaction with the process. Results are highlighted in the SPEC Flyer in terms of: frequency, lead responsibility, participants, guidelines and criteria, related decisions, and satisfaction with the process. Suggestions for improvements in the following areas are also discussed: measures, context, participant, and feedback. In addition to the representative documents, the SPEC Kit includes a list of responding institutions, a checklist of recommendations, and selected readings. (AEF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 325

SPEC

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER

Kit 229

Evaluating Academic Library Directors

May 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.A. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

IR 057124

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER

Flyer 229

Evaluating Academic Library Directors

May 1998

Introduction

Performance evaluation is a widely acknowledged tool for monitoring and promoting effective leadership, an essential ingredient for success in any library organization. In 1997, ARL directors were surveyed as part of a larger study of director review processes that was inirequested by ARL's Leadership and Management Committee. The full report of that study, including a report of follow-up telephone interviews and a checklist for evaluating local review processes, is available as ARL Occasional Paper #21. The 1997 survey updates a 1980 survey of this topic contained in SPEC Kit #72, *Executive Review in ARL Libraries*.

Survey Results

The survey was sent to all 121 ARL directors. Seventy-six directors (63%) responded. The survey asked about factual attributes of director review processes, including frequency of review cycles, participants, and outcomes, as well as about satisfaction with the processes.

Frequency. Sixty-four (84%) of the responding directors reported having some sort of formal performance review. Respondents were asked to choose the cycle that was most critical in their view if there was more than one cycle. Out of 70 responses to this question, 32 (46%) identified the five-year cycle as the most critical, while 24 (34%) identified the annual cycle. Together, these responses accounted for 81% of the total. Six directors (8%) reported never having been reviewed, and eight (11%) reported other frequencies (biennial, every four years, every seven years, and "irregularly"). Twenty-one directors (30%) reported having more than one cycle, typically an annual review and a five-year review.

Lead Responsibility. For 36 institutions (59%), the provost of the university was the review initiator. For nine (15%) it was the vice-president for academic affairs, and for five (8%) it was the vice-president for information systems. Other review initiators included the university president, vice-provost for personnel, a board, and the faculty senate. In most cases, the review initiator also conducted the review (43 respondents or 70%), but in fifteen cases (25%) this responsibility was given to a committee.

Participants. Twenty directors (32%) indicated that no one other than the review initiator—the person's direct supervisor—participated in the review, while 42 directors (68%) indicated a variety of participants in the review process (respondents were asked to note all categories that applied):

Librarians:	39 (93%)
Library support staff:	34 (81%)
Other deans	27 (64%)
Non-library faculty	25 (60%)
Student representatives	24 (57%)
Library committee	24 (57%)
Peers in the profession (outside the library)	17 (40%)
Faculty senate committee	12 (29%)
Alumni	4 (10%)

Guidelines and Criteria. Fifty-eight directors responded to a question about process guidelines. Twenty-four (41%) noted that guidelines were formally established and documented, typically in a faculty or administrative handbook. Eighteen (31%) indicated that the review initiator developed ad hoc process guidelines for the review. Sixteen (28%) responded that no specific guidelines for reviews existed. Fifty-four directors responded to a question about evaluative criteria used in the review process. Twenty (37%) reported that criteria were formally established and documented. Nineteen (35%) said that criteria were established ad hoc by the review initiator or by the director working with that person. Fifteen (28%) reported no specific criteria in use.

Related Decisions. Thirteen responding directors (21%) reported that a salary decision was related to the review. Forty-four (72%) said there was no related salary decision. Related decisions concerning contract renewal or reappointment, however, were much more common. Out of 54 directors responding, 28 (52%) indicated that such decisions were part of the process and 26 (48%) indicated that they were not.

Satisfaction with the Process. Forty-four directors responded to a series of seven items related to various aspects of the helpfulness of the review process. Most of the responses indicated that directors found the processes at least somewhat useful in helping to understand areas for growth and performance improvement and in helping them set goals for the library. A majority also found the present frequency of reviews satisfactory, though a sizable number of those reviewed only on five-year cycles were inclined to want more frequent feedback on their performances.

On several issues, directors were inclined to be less satisfied with the review processes. Many felt that reviews could

be significantly more useful in providing them with appropriate, thoughtful input; in helping them understand institutional goals and priorities; and in enabling them to convey key messages to their parent institutions. The least satisfactory aspect of reviews for respondents was that many processes did not indicate a sufficient appreciation of the special problems and issues related to the director's library.

Changes, Improvements

Though a few directors were happy with their review processes just as they were, several commented on improvements that could be made in four key areas: measures, context, participants, and feedback.

Measures. Several directors commented on the need for measurable criteria in their review processes, as well as clear goals that they would be evaluated against. In some cases, this was a plea for clearer institutional goals within which the library could not only evaluate the director's effectiveness but also its planning and budgeting. Overall, directors who commented wanted to be measured against realistic expectations—expectations that had been discussed and negotiated. For many, the quality of the discussions leading to those expectations was just as important as the expectations themselves. Directors therefore wanted sufficient time, especially with those to whom they reported directly, to develop effective expectations.

Context. Several contextual issues were presented in the comments. One common theme was that many processes were too generic—typically developed for all university deans—and not suitably applicable nor very useful for directors of libraries. Another theme was the confusion often found in the participants (confusion that appears to grow as the process becomes more inclusive), concerning who or what is being evaluated. Is the director's performance being reviewed? Or is it the library's performance? How closely are these two related? Do participants understand the fiscal and policy constraints the director is working within? Do they understand the goals and expectations for the performance? Do they have sufficient contextual information to make a reasoned judgement about what is attributable to the director's leadership and what may be unavoidable about the total context?

Participants. Comments on this aspect of the review process varied greatly according to the directors' experience of reviews in their institutions. Three respondents expressed interest in outside participation, either a visiting committee or a single peer reviewer. Several directors felt another dean with similar responsibilities might be an important addition to the process, especially someone who understood the challenges of administrative leadership; one felt that all participants should indicate the knowledge basis for their assessments of the director—the frequency and nature of contact. Several comments reflected on the less than useful—even counterproductive—outcomes of anonymous participation in the review process, especially when poorly managed.

Feedback. A few directors commented on the quality and usefulness of the feedback received in the review process. The principal problem identified was feedback that is too general or vague, sometimes including lists of comments from participants without any indication of trends or areas for concern.

Conclusion

Formal evaluation of the directors of ARL Libraries is an established and growing fixture of campus human relations programs. In 1980, few directors had formal reviews and only about half of respondents were reviewed informally. Today, a sizable majority of directors (84%) have formal reviews, and a significant number have two review cycles, typically one and five-year cycles.

Like most people in the world of work, ARL directors value fair and effective performance evaluation processes that give them useful data about how they have been doing and what they might do to improve. Several process changes are suggested by the results of this survey. Formal director review processes should have formal written process guidelines and criteria; ideally, these should not be generic but should relate to the responsibilities of the library director. Evaluation should be conducted against clear goals and related performance expectations. Contributors to the evaluation should be aware of performance context, especially when there are special circumstances over which the director has had no control, and they should be educated about the roles and responsibilities of library directors as well as the problems and issues they face. Infrequent performance reviews should be supplemented by interim reviews, either formal or informal, so that the director can make course corrections if necessary.

This Flyer and Kit were prepared by George J. Soete, ARL/OLMS Organizational Development Consultant, as part of a larger study of director review processes in ARL libraries.

See also: *Performance Evaluation of Library Directors: A Study in Current Practice and a Checklist of Recommendations*, published as OLMS Occasional Paper #21.

SPEC Flyer (ISSN 0160 3574) © 1998 by the Association of Research Libraries. ARL grants blanket permission to reproduce this information for educational use as long as complete attribution is given. For commercial use, requests should be sent to the ARL Publications Department, Association of Research Libraries, 21 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. SPEC Kits and Flyers are available by subscription and single issue.

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER

Evaluating Academic Library Directors

A SPEC Kit compiled by

George J. Soete
ARL/OLMS Organizational Development Consultant

May 1998

Series Editor: Patricia Brennan
Production Assistant: Peter Budka

SPEC Kits are published by the

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES
21 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 296-2296 Fax (202) 872-0884
<http://www.arl.org/> <pubs@arl.org>

ISSN 0160 3582

Copyright © 1998

The papers in this compilation are copyrighted by the Association of Research Libraries. ARL grants blanket permission to reproduce and distribute copies of these works for non-profit educational or library purposes, provided that copies are distributed at or below cost, and that ARL, the source, and copyright notice are included on each copy. This permission is in addition to rights of reproduction granted under Sections 107, 108, and other provisions of the U.S. Copyright Act.

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American national Standard for Information Sciences--Performance of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-199X.

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center: Supporting Effective library Management For Over Twenty Years

Committed to assisting research and academic libraries in the continuous improvement of management systems, OLMS has worked with its constituents since 1970 to seek the best practices for meeting the needs of users. The OLMS Information Services Program maintains an active publications program best known for its Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) Kits. Through the OLMS Collaborative Research/Writing Program, librarians work with OLMS staff in joint research and writing projects. Participants and staff work together in survey design, writing, and editing publications that provide valuable insights and management perspectives on emerging trends, issues, and concerns of the academic and research library community. Originally established as an information source for ARL member libraries, the SPEC program has grown to serve the needs of the library community worldwide.

What Are SPEC Kits and Flyers?

Published ten times per year, SPEC Kits and Flyers contain the most valuable, up-to-date information on the latest issues of concern to libraries and librarians today. SPEC Kits and Flyers are the result of a program of surveys on a variety of topics related to current practice and management of library programs in the ARL membership. The SPEC Flyer is a summary of the status of a current area of interest. It comments on the present situation, reports on the results of an ARL membership survey, and forecasts future trends. The SPEC Kit contains the SPEC Flyer and the best representative supporting documentation from the survey in the form of policy statements, handbooks, manuals, cost studies, user studies, procedure statements, planning materials, and issue summaries. A valuable feature of each SPEC Kit is its selected reading list containing the most current literature available on the topic for further study.

Subscribe to SPEC Kits

Subscribers tell us that the information contained in SPEC Kits and Flyers is valuable to a variety of users, both inside and outside the library. The documentation found in SPEC Kits is a good point of departure for research and problem solving. SPEC Kits and Flyers lend immediate authority to proposals and aid in setting standards for designing programs or writing procedure statements. SPEC Kits function as an important reference tool for library administrators, staff, students, and professionals in allied disciplines who many not have access to this kind of information.

SPEC Kits and Flyers can be ordered directly from the ARL Office of Leadership and Management Services or through your library vendor or subscription agent. For more information, contact the ARL Publications Department at (202) 296-2296, fax (202) 872-0884, or <pubs@arl.org>. Information on this and other OLMS products and services can be found on the ARL Web site <http://www.arl.org/>. The Web site for SPEC Kits and Flyers is <http://www.arl.org/spec/specdesc.html>.

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER

Kit 229

Evaluating Academic Library Directors

May 1998

Table of Contents

Survey Results 3
Responding Institutions 8

Representative Documents
Introduction 11
University of Alabama
Associate Provosts/Administrative Deans: Performance Review and Development 13
University of Colorado
Terms of Appointment and Review and Evaluation of Administrative Officers 15
Colorado State University
Five-Year Evaluation 24
Evaluation of Performance of Officers 25
Center for Research Libraries
Evaluative Criteria for the President's Annual Performance Appraisal 26
University of Hawaii–Manoa
Procedures for the Evaluation of Deans and Directors 27
Iowa State University
Library Dean Evaluation Procedures 33
University of Kansas
Deans' and Directors' Administrative Performance Review 35
University of Maryland
Performance Review and Development Process 40
University of Nebraska–Lincoln
Review and Reappointment of Administrative Officers 48
Faculty Evaluation of Dean—Libraries 51
University of New Mexico
Dean/Associate Dean Annual Progress Review 55
University of Tennessee
Report of Senate-Chancellor Committee to Implement a Program of Review of Administrators 58
Faculty Evaluation of Academic Deans 68
Washington State University
Questionnaire for Review of the Director of the WSU Libraries 72

A Checklist of Recommendations
The Academic Library Director Today 85
Key Leadership Roles 85
Checklist for Assessing the Performance Evaluation Process 87

Selected Readings 91

SURVEY RESULTS

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

SPEC SURVEY: EVALUATING ACADEMIC LIBRARY DIRECTORS

August 1, 1997

To: ARL Directors

From: George J. Soete
ARL/OLMS Organizational Development Consultant

In 1980, ARL conducted a survey on the executive review process for ARL Directors. The results were published in SPEC Kit Number 72, March 1981. At the request of the ARL Management Committee, this project is being conducted to update the earlier effort with broader participation. The project has another, more important purpose, however: to provide ARL Directors and review initiators with guidelines and models that will assist in making executive reviews fair, effective, and useful. The publication resulting from this project will be aimed at this practical goal and is targeted for release in fall, 1997. We hope you agree that this is an important project and that you will return the completed survey as soon as possible.

1. How often does the library dean/director receive a performance evaluation? (Note: If you have two or more periodic review cycles—for example, an annual informal review conversation with your provost and a formal review every five years conducted by a university committee on which your continuing appointment depends— please choose the cycle which is the more critical or important in your estimation. Please also check the box at the end of this question if the statement applies to you: we may want to follow up with you in a telephone interview).

Annually	24
Biennially	2
Every five years	32
Other frequency (please specify):	
Seven years	2
Four years	1
Irregularly	3
Never	6
I have more than one review cycle, but for this questionnaire I am focusing on the one that is most critical in my view.	21

21 Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036
202 296 2296 telephone
202 872 0884 fax
http://www.arl.org/

2. Who initiates the review?

Provost/Vice President/Other University Administer to Whom You Report
Please supply exact title: _____
Other (please specify):

Provost	36
V.P.-Academic Affairs	9
Other V.P.	5
Board	3
Assoc. Acad. V.P.	1
Senate	1
Vice-Chancellor	1

3. Who conducts the review?

Same as response to question #2.	43

Other (please specify):

Committee	15
Board	2
President	1

4. Please check all who participate in the evaluation.

Librarians	39
Library staff	34
Non-library faculty	25
Student representatives	24
Other deans	27
Library committee	24
Faculty senate committee	12
Alumni	4
Peers in the profession outside the University	17

Others (please list):

Computer Center Staff	1
Board	3
Physical Plant	1
Financial Services	1
Public Relations Director	1
Campus-wide	3

5. Please characterize the evaluation process guidelines used in the director evaluation.

Formally established and documented (please supply a copy).	24
Established by the reviewer, ad hoc.	18
No specific guidelines are used.	16
Other (please comment).	2

6. Please characterize the evaluation criteria by which the director is evaluated.

Formally established and documented (please supply a copy).	20
Established by the reviewer, ad hoc.	19
No specific criteria.	15
Other (please comment).	2

7. Are there written criteria against which the review is conducted?

Yes	21
No	35

If yes, please be sure to supply a copy of the written criteria with the documentation that you send us.

8 Is a salary decision attached to the review?

Yes	13
No	43

9. Is contract renewal or reappointment a part of the process?

Yes	28
No	26

10. Does the evaluation procedure include a conversation with the director's immediate superior?

Yes	46
No	7

11. Are there periodic performance assessment conversations with the immediate superior or with others between the regular, documented evaluations?

Yes	28
No	24

12. Please give your impression of how helpful the review process is in the following areas. Circle one number on each scale.

a. The process helps me understand areas for growth and improvement in my performance.

Very Helpful	5	4	3	2	1	Not Helpful
N = 44	10	18	6	7	3	

b. The process helps me understand institutional goals and priorities.

Very Helpful	5	4	3	2	1	Not Helpful
N = 44	6	13	11	5	9	

c. The process helps me set goals for the Library.

Very Helpful	5	4	3	2	1	Not Helpful
N = 44	9	16	11	5	9	

d. The process helps me convey key messages to my parent institution.

Very Helpful	5	4	3	2	1	Not Helpful
N = 43	9	16	8	5	5	

e. The review is conducted frequently enough to be useful to me.

Very Helpful	5	4	3	2	1	Not Helpful
N = 44	10	10	13	4	5	

f. The review process indicates an appreciation of the special problems and issues related to my library.

Very Helpful	5	4	3	2	1	Not Helpful
N = 43	7	10	12	9	5	

g. The review process provides me with appropriate, thoughtful input of useful depth.

Very Helpful	5	4	3	2	1	Not Helpful
N = 44	7	14	9	11	3	

13. What changes or improvements would you suggest in the process for your institution? Please comment here or in an attachment.

14. Can you supply documentation related to the process of executive review in your institution? Of particular interest are written procedures, criteria, forms, etc., used in the process. Please send documentation with your response.

Yes, documentation is enclosed or is being faxed with this survey
Yes, documentation will follow
There is documentation, but I cannot supply it
There is no documentation

15. Would you be willing to be interviewed by phone as a follow-up to this survey? If so, please list your telephone number here:

Telephone number: _____

16. Other comments? Please write them here or attach (or fax) on a separate sheet.

Responding Institutions

University of Alabama
University of Alberta
University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Boston Public Library
Brigham Young University
Brown University
University of California–Davis
University of California–Irvine
University of California–Los Angeles
Center for Research Libraries
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
Colorado State University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
University of Florida
Florida State University
University of Georgia
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Hawaii
University of Houston
University of Illinois–Chicago
University of Illinois–Urbana
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
University of Kansas
Kent State University
University of Kentucky
Linda Hall Library
Louisiana State University
McGill University
McMaster University
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
National Library of Canada
University of Nebraska–Lincoln
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina
University Libraries of Notre Dame
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
University of Rochester
University of Saskatchewan
Smithsonian Institution
University of South Carolina
Southern Illinois University
SUNY–Albany
SUNY–Buffalo
SUNY–Stony Brook
Syracuse University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas
Texas A&M University
Texas Tech University
University of Toronto
Tulane University
University of Utah
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
University of Washington
Washington State University
Washington University
University of Waterloo
Yale University
York University

REPRESENTATIVE DOCUMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Several directors submitted documents used in the director evaluation processes in their institutions. Selected documents are presented here with brief annotations.

Though there appears to be much solid practice in them, ARL does not necessarily endorse the processes described in these documents and offers them only as tools for exploring options as institutions consider modifications in their executive review processes.

University of Alabama. This document, *Associate Provosts/Administrative Deans: Performance Review and Development*, suggests a very detailed, carefully documented process, similar in some ways to non-administrative staff evaluation processes. Featured are six core performance factors (leadership, management, budgeting, collaboration, public relations, and diversity), specific actions, and measurement indicators that demonstrate effective performance in each factor. The Alabama director is reviewed every five years.

University of Colorado. Section II of *Terms of Appointment and Review and Evaluation of Administrative Officers* lays out a three-cycle review process: 1) annual reviews related to compensation adjustment; 2) preliminary administrative review, conducted for new appointees during the last year or two of their first five-year cycle; and 3) comprehensive five-year reviews. Distinctive features of the process include:

> a list of standard criteria that those being reviewed must meet;
>
> a discussion and agreement between the person being reviewed and the reviewer on other criteria for assessment; and
>
> an evaluation of the resources and other support needed to ensure that future responsibilities and expectations are fulfilled."

This last feature is worth special attention, as it addresses a concern of some ARL directors that they will be held accountable for problems that are really attributable to resource shortages. Here is the relevant text:

> The review shall include an assessment of the resources available to the officer in fulfilling the responsibilities of the position. Although care should be exercised to assure that the individual is not held accountable for circumstances beyond the person's direct control or for accomplishments which would also require resources beyond those available, it must also be recognized that the ability to manage within the constraints of scarce resources may be an expected performance skill.

Colorado State University. The director is reviewed annually and at five-year intervals. A form letter soliciting comment on nine performance criteria for the five-year review is included in the documentation.

Center for Research Libraries. This library is unusual in the ARL setting in that it is not a university library. The director (president) is reviewed annually by the Center's board of directors using the *Evaluative Criteria for the President's Annual Performance Appraisal*.

University of Hawaii–Manoa. This document, *Procedures for the Evaluation of Deans and Directors,* describes a review process for deans at the University of Hawaii, including an annual evaluation and a periodic comprehensive evaluation. There are seven core criteria, and other criteria may be added in reference to the dean's specific assignment.

Iowa State University. This brief document, *Library Dean Evaluation Procedures,* calls for: 1) a self-assessment by the dean; and 2) faculty evaluation of the dean using seven criteria, as well as any others that might be requested by the provost.

University of Kansas. This document, *Deans' and Directors' Administrative Performance Review,* calls for a "self-study" from the dean and cites ten criterion areas in which "strengths and weaknesses may be examined." This process is interesting for its stipulated time-frame: "The period of time between the first meeting of the review committee and submission of the final report should not exceed 90 days." The process also calls for a site visit by the university reviewing committee—in this case time spent by committee members in the library: "Such visits provide an opportunity to verify written documentation, gather additional data, and interview constituent groups and key individuals."

University of Maryland. This document, *Performance Review and Development Process,* is the actual form used in performance reviews of deans and other academic administrators. The process includes three phases: a) setting expectations; b) midway feedback session; and c) final appraisal. Goals, objectives, action plans, and definitions of "meets expectations" are negotiated between the director and the supervisor and laid out in detail; performance related to each goal is assessed on a five-part scale, from outstanding to unsatisfactory. The form includes a development plan which focuses on major strengths, areas for improvement, and action plans.

University of Nebraska–Lincoln. The first document, *Review and Reappointment of Administrative Officers,* describes the policy for annual and cumulative performance reviews. The second set of documents relates to evaluation instruments used by library faculty and staff. The instruments, which are used in evaluations of all deans at Nebraska, ask staff to respond to a number of statements using a five-point Likert scale. Also included is a page of open-ended questions.

University of New Mexico. This document, *Dean/Associate Dean Annual Progress Report,* represents a distinctive annual review process which was developed by the present library director. The review is completely internal, with all library staff given a chance to comment on the director's performance. A lengthy, detailed set of criteria is included. Again, a form with a five-point Likert scale is used: the form is available on the World Wide Web at <www.unm.edu/-libadmin/person/perpolicydeanreview.htm>.

University of Tennessee. The first document is a long portion of the *Report of [the] Senate-Chancellor Committee to Implement a Program of Review of Administrators;* included in an appendix is a long questionnaire meant to be used by faculty in evaluating all academic deans at Tennessee. The second document is the questionnaire that was actually used as part of the 1994-95 evaluation process for the present library director. One interesting feature of the Tennessee process is that individual deans are given aggregated data comparing their results with those of other deans.

Washington State University. This documentation, *Questionnaire for Review of the Director of the WSU Libraries,* is an extensive evaluation sent to all library staff, "plus a random sample of other faculty and students." The form uses a four-point Likert scale and focuses on four performance areas for the director as well as one (effectiveness) for the library. Of some interest is a request for background information on each evaluator which asks respondents to indicate how closely they interact with the director's office.

ASSOCIATE PROVOSTS/ADMINISTRATIVE DEANS

PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT

1. **FACTOR: Leadership**

   Action Plan: Advocate across the campus the needs and importance of graduate and/or undergraduate education. Promote the goals of graduate and/or undergraduate education and identify current and future issues. Foster the implementation of the campus strategic plan.

   Definition of Meeting Expectations: Evidence of effective campus advocacy.

2. **FACTOR: Management**

   Action Plan: Establish and maintain an administrative structure that is responsive to faculty, students and client needs. This includes identification of problems and opportunities, analysis of situations, implementations of strategies for problem resolution and evaluation of results.

   Definition of Meeting Expectations: Continual review of management structure and implementation of appropriate changes to meet changing management needs.

3. **FACTOR: Budgeting**

   Action Plan: Effectively manage the unit budget. Seek expanded resources for academic, research and service programs. Work to improve service delivery within the current budget constraints.

   Definition of Meeting Expectations: Determined by effective close out of budget at year-end. Evidence of significant new support for academic, research and service programs from government, corporate and other sponsors.

4. **FACTOR:** Interdepartmental, Cross College and Campus Collaboration

   Action Plan: Develop strategies to encourage and facilitate collaboration in academic programs and research activities.

   Definition of Meeting Expectations: Evidence demonstrating activities leading to successful programs.

5. **FACTOR: Public Relations**

Action Plan: Develop an effective internal and external communications plan that highlights success of the unit by reaching out to existing and new audiences. Identify ways in which public relations plan can advance the goals of undergraduate and/or graduate education and advance the capital campaign.

Definition of Meeting Expectations: Review of the public relations plan and success in meeting goals established.

6. **FACTOR: Diversity**

Action Plan: Develop a climate that encourages recruitment and retention of a diverse staff and student body. This should include efforts to effectively communicate with and meet the needs of a diverse population through appropriate maintenance of a supportive work environment, and promotion of and participation in multi-cultural activities.

Definition of Meeting Expectations: Initiatives undertaken that contribute to campus diversity goals.

Terms of Appointment and Review and Evaluation
of Administrative Officers

II. Review and Evaluation of Administrative Officers

The review and evaluation of officers is one component of a broader program to improve performance, service and working relationships. The Laws of the Regents provides for 1) an annual review of officer performance, 2) a preliminary administrative review for officers on initial appointments, and 3) periodic comprehensive evaluations of officer performance. Although this policy recognizes the primary role of the supervising senior officer in the evaluation process, it is important that the officer work closely with the President, the appropriate Chancellor, and the Comprehensive Evaluation Advisory Panel* in order to ensure that these policies are implemented in a constructive fashion.

The supervising senior officer and the officer under review shall, in a timely fashion, agree on evaluation criteria and priorities within those criteria. The following criteria shall be among those used unless inappropriate for the officer under review:

1) effectiveness of working relationships;
2) respect for, accessibility to, and communication with peers and other constituencies;
3) open and timely decision-making process;
4) leadership in assigned responsibilities;
5) commitment to professional growth and encouragement of innovation and creativity for staff;
6) implementation of affirmative action and equal opportunity policies and leadership in promoting diversity within the University community;
7) administration of fiscal resources;
8) management and support of personnel and unit morale; and
9) technical competence in areas of expertise related to the particular position.

A. Annual Review**

As a part of the annual compensation adjustment process, an evaluation is completed for all administrative officers.

This annual review is an opportunity for the officer to receive feedback from the supervising senior officer on his or her service over the past year and to agree with the

---

* Established under Section II-C of this Administrative Policy.

** The administrative policy "Performance Ratings for Faculty, Unclassified Staff/Administrators, and Officers" should be consulted for policies on conducting annual performance ratings.

supervising senior officer on areas of emphasis for the following year. Guidelines for this review will be distributed annually to each campus Chancellor along with the annual compensation policies. The senior officer will have discretion to prescribe the particular method of review and evaluation, as long as it is consistent with the annual guidelines.

B. Preliminary Administrative Review

The preliminary administrative review is designed to provide administrative officers with constructive feedback on their accomplishments and service during their initial term of appointment. This preliminary review is not a formal evaluation of an officer's service to the institution. Rather, it is an opportunity for the newly appointed officer to strengthen his or her performance by receiving a preliminary assessment from the supervising senior officer of his or her administrative service to the institution and agreeing with the supervising senior officer on future priorities.

- Responsibility/Specifications. It is the responsibility of the supervising senior officer to determine the appropriate method for the preliminary review and to notify the officer of that method. In any event the method shall provide an opportunity for the officer on initial appointment a) to review with the supervising senior officer the responsibilities of the position; b) to self-assess his or her performance in relation to these responsibilities; and c) to review this self-assessment, with the supervising senior officer for the purpose of agreeing on future priorities and expectations of performance.

  The supervising senior officer shall decide, after consultation with the Chancellor, President and/or Board of Regents, as appropriate, whether there shall be external input and, if so, what the nature of that input will be. It is the President's intent that the preliminary review process shall provide for input from constituencies, appropriate to the responsibilities of the officer, so that information from constituencies is available to the supervising senior officer and appropriate feedback is given to constituencies. When an officer with academic responsibilities is the subject of a preliminary review, the faculty shall be considered a constituency of that officer.

  The supervising senior officer shall review the results of the preliminary administrative review with the officer for the purpose of agreeing on future priorities and

expectations for performance. A summary report of the preliminary administrative review shall be placed in the officer's personnel file.

- Timetable/Notification to the Board of Regents. For initial appointments of less than five years, the preliminary administrative review should be completed not later than one year prior to the end of the appointment. For administrative officers on initial five year appointments, the preliminary administrative review should be completed in the third year of appointment.

  The campus Chancellor shall inform the Executive Vice President of the commencement of all preliminary administrative reviews at the campus. The Executive Vice President shall notify the Board of Regents of the commencement of all preliminary administrative reviews.

C. Comprehensive Evaluation

The comprehensive evaluation gives the supervising senior officer and the officer under review the opportunity to assess the officer's responsibilities, performance and development from a longer-range point of view. This comprehensive evaluation encompasses (1) an assessment of future responsibilities and expectations for performance; (2) an evaluation of the resources and other support needed to ensure that future responsibilities and expectations are fulfilled; as well as (3) an assessment of whether existing responsibilities have in fact been fulfilled and expectations met.

- Timetable. All administrative officers shall be comprehensively evaluated during the final year of their initial appointment and in each fifth year of service thereafter.

  The Chancellor's Office at each campus will maintain a current roster of administrative officers at the campus. Each September, the Chancellor or designee shall notify appropriate senior officers of comprehensive evaluations due during the year. The Office of the Executive Vice President will maintain a roster of all administrative officers in the President's Office and each Chancellor. The Executive Vice President shall notify appropriate senior officers in the President's Office.

  Evaluation procedures should be completed and outcome information provided to the officers evaluated prior to March 1 of that fiscal year.

Terms of Appointment and Review and Evaluation
of Administrative Officers

- Advisory Panel. The President and each Chancellor shall establish a standing panel to advise supervising senior officers on comprehensive evaluation procedures. The President's Advisory Panel will advise on review procedures for officers in the Offices of the President. The Chancellor's Advisory Panel will advise on review procedures for campus officers.

  1. Chancellor's Advisory Panel. The Chancellor's Advisory Panel shall include a campus faculty representative, a campus staff representative, a campus student representative and such other individuals as the Chancellor may appoint. The Advisory Panel shall have available a list of all comprehensive evaluations of campus officers scheduled for the year. For each comprehensive evaluation, such panel shall confirm to the Chancellor that the evaluation process determined by the supervising senior officer is consistent with the provisions of this policy.

  2. President's Advisory Panel. The President's Advisory Panel shall include a faculty representative, nominated by the Faculty Council, and a staff representative, nominated by the Inter-Campus Staff Council and such other individuals as the President may appoint. The Advisory Panel shall have available a list of all comprehensive evaluations of officers in the Offices of the President scheduled for the year. For each comprehensive evaluation, such panel shall confirm to the President that the evaluation process determined by the supervising senior officer is consistent with the provisions of this policy.

- Specifications. The supervising senior officer is responsible for conducting the comprehensive evaluation. Consistent with the above provision on the Advisory Panel, the supervising senior officer has discretion to determine the particular method for review and evaluation. The supervising senior officer shall notify the officer to be evaluated of that method.

  The review and evaluation shall meet the following minimum specifications:

  1. The supervising senior officer shall seek written evaluative information from the constituencies of the officer under review regarding the officer's

performance and accomplishments. When an officer with academic responsibilities is the subject of a comprehensive evaluation, the faculty shall be considered a constituency of that officer. The supervising senior officer is encouraged to consult with appropriate individuals, agencies and organizations external to the University of Colorado.

2. The supervising senior officer and the officer evaluated shall use the review to confirm general agreement on future duties and responsibilities of the position as well as to assess past performance. Operational position descriptions developed at the time of appointment, specific charges or statements of responsibility, and, where appropriate, prior agreements with regard to goals and objectives are all valid bases for such agreement and for assessment, provided such statements have been operational for at least one year prior to the evaluation.

3. In evaluating whether current responsibilities have been fulfilled, the criteria listed on page 3 of this policy shall also be used unless inappropriate.

4. The review shall include an assessment of the resources available to the officer in fulfilling the responsibilities of the position. Although care should be exercised to assure that the individual is not held accountable for circumstances beyond the person's direct control or for accomplishments which would require resources beyond those available, it must also be recognized that the ability to manage within the constraints of scarce resources may be an expected performance skill.

5. The officer being evaluated shall have the opportunity to provide a statement of accomplishment and self-evaluation. This statement shall be used as an integral part of the appraisal process.

6. The supervising senior officer may require the officer being evaluated to undergo a complete medical examination as a part of the comprehensive evaluation. When requested by the senior officer, the examination will be conducted by the officer's personal physician at University expense. The results of this examination will be made available

to a physician named by the University who shall interpret the results of this examination to the supervising senior officer.

- o Outcomes

1. The supervising senior officer shall report the results of the evaluation process to the officer in a manner that will protect working relationships and at the same time provide opportunities for improved performance on the part of the individual evaluated.

2. A summary report of the comprehensive evaluation shall be entered into the officer's personnel file. This report shall include a) a description of the evaluation process; b) a list of the constituencies that participated in the evaluation; c) a summary statement of the officer's self-evaluation; and d) conclusions of the evaluation with respect to each evaluation criterion.

3. Where the comprehensive evaluation has identified resource issues that are critical to future performance, those resource issues shall be summarized and incorporated into discussions of institutional programs and budgets.

4. The President shall report the results of the comprehensive review to the Personnel Committee of the Board of Regents. In making personnel recommendations regarding an administrative officer's appointment, the supervising senior officer shall consider the results of the comprehensive evaluation.

5. Appropriate feedback shall be provided orally to the Advisory Panel. The Advisory Panel shall honor its obligation of confidentiality on personnel matters.

III. Reassignment, Nonrenewal, and Termination

Service as an administrative officer is at the pleasure of the Board of Regents and the President, acting through appropriate designees.

A. Reassignment. The President and the Board of Regents have the right to reassign an officer at any time during the period of appointment. A term of appointment is not a guarantee of a particular role, assignment or salary level for the term of appointment. Reassignment during a term of appointment may be made by the senior officer to whom the officer reports at a salary appropriate for the

position available, as determined by that senior officer. Reassignment requires no prior administrative review or evaluation of the officer. Decisions by the senior officer regarding reassignment, including salary level, are subject to the normal review and approval procedures required by Regental policy. An officer may choose not to accept reassignment. An officer who elects not to accept reassignment waives all rights to six months' notice of non-reappointment or termination.

B. Nonrenewal and Termination. Nonrenewal or termination of an administrative appointment requires no statement of reason by the University. Officers have no rights to appeal nonrenewal or termination of an appointment. An administrative officer may be terminated or nonrenewed by the senior officer to whom he or she reports or by the Board of Regents.

Administrative officers shall receive six months' prior written notice of nonrenewal. Administrative officers shall normally receive six months' prior written notice of termination unless there are special circumstances, in which case, administrative officers shall receive such prior written notice of termination as the senior officer or the Board of Regents shall deem appropriate under the circumstances. Service during any notice period will be at the discretion of the senior officer or the Board of Regents.

The letter or contract of employment for an officer shall stipulate that should the officer not be reappointed, and the six-month notice period places the officer into a new annual appointment period based on his/her appointment date, the officer shall not be deemed to have a new contract, but simply an extension designed to ensure that the officer will receive six months' notice.

C. Termination for Reasons of Health. Appointment of an administrative officer may be terminated when the physical or mental disability of an individual prevents or substantially interferes with the performance of his or her duties. Such termination may occur when the accumulated sick leave of the disabled individual has expired and the individual is not otherwise eligible to accept retirement. Such termination will not be effected in a manner that deprives the individual of the benefits of any disability insurance or benefit to which he or she otherwise would be entitled. Consistent with this policy, the senior officer may require a medical examination at any time during the officer's term of appointment.

D. Academic Tenure. For administrators with academic tenure, termination or nonrenewal of an administrative appointment does not affect academic tenure status. Termination of an academic tenured appointment is an independent procedure and is subject to the normal Regental policies pertaining to the matter.

IV. Confidentiality

Under Colorado's Open Records Act, the University must protect the confidentiality of all personnel information other than performance ratings and applications. The Executive Vice President serves as the official custodian for information pertaining to the evaluations of Chancellors and officers in the President's Office. Each campus should have a designated official custodian for personnel information relating to campus officers other than the Chancellor. For further information, please refer to the administrative policy statement entitled "Treatment of Personnel Files for Purposes of the Colorado Open Records Act."

V. Interpretation of Policy

Consistent with Article VIII of the Laws of the Regents which defines the responsibilities of the President as the "chief academic and administrative officer of the University" and the "chief spokesman for and interpreter of University policy," the President is responsible for interpreting Regental policies and is responsible for defining the conditions of appointment and responsibilities of all officers within these policies.

VI. Application of Policies to Officers Appointed Before February 19, 1987

Administrative officers appointed before February 19, 1987, will not continue to serve under the former Regental policies. Consistent with Regental intent, the policies in this administrative policy statement are applicable to officers appointed before February 19, 1987. To implement this transition, the following additional policies on terms of appointment and evaluation apply to officers appointed before February 19, 1987.

A. Officers on Initial Appointments. For officers on initial appointments, the supervising senior officer, after consultation with the officer under review, shall choose one of the following options:

1. Conduct a preliminary administrative review and, depending on the outcome, recommend to the Board of Regents that the officer's current term be extended to a full five-year term with the first comprehensive

review conducted during the period of July-December in the fifth year of the appointment. Thereafter, the officer will serve on a renewable annual appointment with the comprehensive review conducted in every fifth year of service.

2. Conduct the comprehensive review as currently scheduled (i.e., during July-December of the final year of appointment and every fifth year of service thereafter).

B. Officers on Existing Multiple Year Appointments. Officers who are on existing multiple year appointments will complete their existing term of appointment. Thereafter, the officer will serve on a renewable annual appointment. The supervising senior officer, after consultation with the officer under review, shall choose one of the following options:

1. Conduct the comprehensive review at the time originally scheduled under previous Regental policies. A comprehensive review will be conducted in every fifth year of service thereafter; or

2. On the basis of an annual review, extend, with Board approval, the existing review cycle for up to a maximum total of five years. After the comprehensive review is completed, a comprehensive review will be conducted in every fifth year of service thereafter.

Five-Year Evaluation -
College of
January 13, 1997

A. Please provide information concerning Dean ____'s performance in the following categories:

1. Leadership in providing future direction for the college
2. Advocacy for College programs and personnel
3. Management of College programs and resources
4. Financial management
5. Commitment to the University community
6. Involvement with Department/College/University strategic planning processes
7. Leadership and management in carrying out University aims, goals, and strategies contained within the University Strategic Plan
8. Commitment and support for enhancement of diversity within the College and University
9. Promotion of College programs to external constituents, including fund-raising efforts.

B. What do you perceive are the dean's strengths in his role as Dean of the College of _____?

C. What do you perceive as areas that need improvement in the dean's role as Dean of the College of _____?

D. Please provide any additional information you feel would be helpful for this evaluation.

_____
Signature

_____
Department

C.2.7 Evaluation of Performance of Officers

a. The performance of each department head shall be evaluated annually by the dean of the appropriate college. In making the evaluation, the dean shall solicit and utilize information obtained from all faculty members in the respective department.

b. The performance of each dean shall be evaluated annually by the Provost/Academic Vice President. When evaluating a college dean, the Provost/Academic Vice President shall solicit and utilize information from the faculty of the dean's college obtained in accordance with that college's procedures.

c. The performance of each Vice President shall be evaluated annually by the President. In making the evaluation, the President shall solicit and utilize information obtained from all deans and directors reporting to the respective Vice President.

d. The performance of the President is evaluated by the State Board of Agriculture. In its evaluation, the Board solicits faculty opinion which is provided by the Faculty Council and its Executive Committee through the Faculty Council Representative to the State Board of Agriculture.

e. Effectiveness in meeting diversity goals and providing equal opportunity to all persons shall be included in evaluations of all administrative officers.

C.2.8 Amendment Procedure

This Code may be amended by the Faculty Council by a two-thirds vote of the members voting at a given meeting provided the amendment has been presented in the meeting immediately preceding. Amendments shall be subject to the approval of the Governing Board. Such proposed Code changes shall be published in the agenda.

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The purpose of this document is to articulate a set of clear evaluative criteria to be used by the Board of Directors in the process of annual appraisal of the performance of the President of the Center for Research Libraries. The results of this process contribute to the assessment by the Board of the President's performance over the total year's activity, and to its judgment on setting the President's compensation for the following year.

1. How has the President managed throughout the year? What strengths or weaknesses has the President displayed in management? Has the President exhibited a sound knowledge of good management techniques? Have the objectives of the organization been met?

2. How has the President performed in internal and in external relationships throughout the year? Has the President successfully represented the Center's best interests when relating to others?

3. What has been the quality of the custodianship of the Center's funds throughout the year? Has the President exercised good judgment in the handling of the Center's budgets and funds? Has the President displayed a sound knowledge of financial and budgetary techniques?

4. Has the President provided sound guidance to the Board of Directors on the future of the Center? Has the President offered effective leadership for the organization as a whole? Has the President successfully carried out the will and intent of the Board of Directors? Has the President displayed effective planning skills?

5. What, if any, unique attributes and/or substantial strengths has the President exhibited (or failed to exhibit) in the position this year? What, if any, have been the major achievements (or failures) of the President's administration this year? What have been the professional achievements of the President this year, such as participation in professional societies and contribution to the body of knowledge of the profession?

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA

PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF DEANS AND DIRECTORS

November 1996

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies, Section 9-14. Part IV. A. states:

> Every appointee to an Executive/Managerial position shall be evaluated for performance and accomplishments annually during the April-June period according to criteria and procedures established by the President. Such evaluation shall include a review of the position description and classification assignment of the position to which the individual has been appointed. The results of the evaluation shall be the basis for reappointment as appropriate and for consideration of salary adjustments.

The procedures herein are based on the 1996 Report of the seven-member Joint Faculty Administration Advisory Committee. The procedures and operating guidelines which follow have been adopted by the Senior Vice President and Executive Vice Chancellor ("SVP/EVC"), Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate Division ("SVPRDGD"), and Vice President for Student Affairs ("VPSA"), and approved by the President.

This document describes procedures for evaluating academic Mānoa Deans and Directors ("D/D")[1], i.e., those reporting to the SVP/EVC, SVPRDGD, and VPSA. The evaluation of each D/D shall be performed by the VP to whom s/he reports. There shall be two types of evaluations, both written: 1) an **annual evaluation** and 2) a **periodic comprehensive evaluation**, which replaces the annual evaluation for that year. The intervals between comprehensive evaluations of each D/D shall be at the VP's discretion, but these evaluations shall occur at least once every five years. The Office of the Senior Vice President and Executive Vice Chancellor ("OSVP/EVC") shall oversee the process.

---

[1]Throughout this document, the abbreviation "D/D" represents "Dean(s) and/or Director(s)" depending on the context. The abbreviation "VP" refers specifically to the Senior Vice President and Executive Vice Chancellor, the Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate Division, and the Vice President for Student Affairs.

These procedures apply only to Executives with administrative responsibility over a School, College, Institute, Center, or other academic unit with oversight over faculty at Mānoa and who report directly to a VP. The following are excluded: (1) Directors who do not have E/M appointments, and are thus evaluated according to procedures in the UHPA Agreement: Directors of Admissions and Records, Industrial Relations Center, Laboratory Animal Service, Lyon Arboretum, Office of Research Services, Office of Technology Transfer and Economic Development, Sea Grant College, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i Press, Waikīkī Aquarium, and Water Resources Research Center; and (2) Directors who do not report directly to a VP: Director of Student Housing, Co-Curricular Activities Programs and Services, and Financial Aids Services.

The two types of evaluation are similar, using similar criteria but differing primarily in the extent of information gathered to serve as the basis of the evaluation. For the comprehensive evaluation, an attempt is made to insure widespread input from all interested individuals. As a further distinction, the comprehensive evaluation adds a deliberative group with a campus-based perspective analogous to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee in the faculty tenure/promotion review process. The campus-wide review committee shall be known as the Deans and Directors Review Committee ("DDRC"). Finally, the comprehensive evaluation is based on the period since the last comprehensive evaluation (based on a five-year cycle), while the annual review has a one-year focus.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the evaluation process is to initiate the regular, ongoing and constructive review of the Dean's performance in meeting the mission, goals and challenges of the unit.

The annual evaluation allows a systematic documentation of the achievements and progress of the unit and its administrators by obtaining input primarily from the unit's faculty, staff, and students. The focus of the annual evaluation is to provide the VP and D/D an opportunity to review: 1) the D/D's leadership, management, and communication skills in relation to achieving the goals of and meeting challenges facing the unit; and 2) the mission, goals, performance, and progress of the unit. By providing a "neutral venue" for input, the intent is to encourage feedback that will improve or enhance productivity and morale and promote a sense of shared governance.

The comprehensive evaluation is intended to seek broader input, both internal and external. It is a review of the mission, goals, and performance of the unit and its "chief executive officer." Unlike a program review, it seeks to obtain input on the leadership, management, and communication skills of the D/D. Through a campus-wide DDRC, comprised of peers and external experts, as needed, input will be synthesized and assessed to provide constructive feedback to enhance the performance of the D/D. The VP will meet with the D/D to review the evaluation, which will cover both satisfactory performance and areas for growth/improvement.

CRITERIA

At an appropriate time prior to the evaluation, the VP and D/D shall discuss and agree on the importance of the following criteria in relation to: 1) the D/D's position; 2) the individual D/D; and 3) the D/D's unit objectives. Attention should be given to job descriptions as a basis for the performance evaluation. If outdated, job descriptions should be revised prior to the evaluation. The evaluation process should be used to clarify expectations about the scope of the job and the goals and objectives for performance in the job. The job description and objectives discussed with the D/D and approved by the VP shall serve as the basis for the evaluation.

While additional evaluative criteria may be identified by the VP in reference to the specific D/D's job description and unit, the following items pertain, with varying degrees of emphasis, to each D/D and shall be considered during the evaluation:

1) **Leadership Abilities**
   (e.g., possible indicators may include D/D's actions to inspire confidence, clearly articulate the goals of the unit, guide the unit to accomplish those goals, and encourage ideas and creativity in all members of the unit; identification of needs for further development; and morale of the unit)

2) **Management Abilities**
   (e.g., possible indicators may include the methods used to administer and develop personnel policies and procedures; whether faculty are effectively recruited and periodically evaluated so as to increase their productivity; budget development and implementation; problem solving; decision making; and whether academic, research and administrative needs are met)

3) **Interpersonal Relationships**
   (e.g., possible indicators may include the D/D's actions to address needs and concerns of faculty/staff/students; fairness; tact; recognition of the activities of all members of the unit; and sensitivity to career and mentoring needs of faculty/staff/students)

4) **Communication Skills**
   (e.g., possible indicators may include the ability of the D/D to communicate effectively at the University, state, national and international levels)

5) **Research/Creative/Professional Endeavors**
   (e.g., possible indicators may include knowledge of new trends in D/D's field; the quality of his/her original work, as appropriate; and research productivity of the faculty)

6) **Quality of Education**
   (e.g., possible indicators may include the quality of graduates, employability, and continuation to advanced degrees; student recruitment and support services; appropriate program and curriculum offerings; and external accreditation reviews and evaluations)

7) **Support for Institutional Diversity**
   (e.g., possible indicators may include commitment and leadership in advancing and supporting equal employment opportunities and affirmative action programs, mentoring women and faculty from underrepresented groups, providing reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, and ensuring all faculty and staff are educated in EEO/AA concerns)

ANNUAL EVALUATION

Self-Assessment

For the first evaluation cycle, the VP shall meet with the D/D in the Fall 1996. For subsequent evaluations, the criteria would be established at the annual evaluation meeting to be held during the April to June period. The D/D shall prepare a brief (no more than five pages) self-assessment to address those criteria in the context of goals and accomplishments of the unit, and shall submit his/her self-assessment to the appropriate VP by April 1. The self-assessment document should include:

1) summary of accomplishments and the extent to which the goals were met during the period of evaluation;

2) proposed goals for the coming year, to be discussed and refined during the evaluation process;

3) (Optional) the adequacy of resources that were provided or will be needed to accomplish the stated goals.

Input from Faculty, Staff, and Students

In April, a questionnaire, which includes space for open-ended comments, will be distributed to all faculty and staff in the unit. It shall also be made available to the unit's student organization(s) to distribute to interested students. Questionnaires will be returned to the OSVP/EVC (attention Dr. Christine Des Jarlais, Bachman 105) no later than May 1 for compilation. The information will then be submitted directly to the appropriate VP.

In units where a Director reports to both a VP and a Dean (e.g. SOEST and CTAHR), the Director being evaluated will send a copy of the self-assessment to the Dean at the same time it is sent to the appropriate VP. The Dean shall prepare an independent evaluation of the Director and forward this to the appropriate VP by May 1.

VP Assessment and Recommendation

The VP may solicit other sources of input, e.g., D/D's colleagues, system and campus administrators, and off-campus constituents. The VP may also call for the D/D file and re-read written evaluation(s) from the previous year(s).

The VP shall review and consider the evaluative information obtained from all sources before preparing a brief written evaluation to be discussed with the D/D. Between May and July the VP shall meet individually with the D/D to discuss the evaluation, agree on the goals for the coming year, and discuss recommendations. The VP shall then finalize the written evaluation and provide a copy to the D/D. The VP shall also send a copy to the President/Chancellor. Finally, the VP shall transmit

the evaluation to the Office of Human Resources for incorporation into the D/D's official personnel file. At the time the official evaluation is transmitted, all copies of all working documents shall be destroyed.

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

By November 1, the VP shall identify all D/Ds subject to a comprehensive evaluation. The VP shall then constitute an appropriate DDRC. A single, campus-wide DDRC will be appointed annually by the three VPs. A single DDRC will afford a unified viewpoint for the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Composition of the Deans and Directors Review Committee

The DDRC shall be comprised of eight members and shall include tenured faculty at rank 5 and other deans and directors (or retired/emeritus deans or directors) from both the academic and administrative segments of the Mānoa campus. To ensure that individuals with appropriate expertise are performing the evaluation, additional persons external to the Mānoa campus may be appointed to the DDRC. The Faculty Senate and each D/D being evaluated that year shall nominate candidate members for the DDRC. D/Ds will be allowed to exclude up to ten (10) names from serving on their DDRC. The actual membership shall be determined by the VPs taking into consideration the following:

- Effective evaluation of the leader of an organization requires substantial input from members of that organization (faculty in particular);
- Members of the DDRC should be free of any potential conflict of interest;
- Identity of the DDRC members shall be public knowledge.

Self-Assessment

By April 1, 1997 (thereafter January 1), the D/D being evaluated shall provide the DDRC with a written statement of accomplishments since the last comprehensive review, in the context of the criteria established through previous consultation with the VP. Whenever possible, quantitative evidence should be presented, such as rankings of the quality of creative work by members of the unit with that of other similar units as judged by external review bodies; the amount of grant funds or other external support obtained by the unit; summaries of teaching evaluations; the number of quality faculty recruited or retained; and the numbers of students, faculty and staff who are women, minorities or under-represented ethnic groups, persons with disabilities, and veterans in the unit. If available, the D/D shall also transmit evaluations by external bodies, such as accreditation or visiting committees.

DDRC Assessment

The DDRC shall review the D/D self-assessment and criteria previously agreed upon with the VP in order to obtain relevant data for the D/D evaluation. Since the opinions of people under the oversight of the D/D are very important in the review process, the DDRC shall solicit written evaluations from every faculty member and staff and from representative students in the D/D's unit. The DDRC may decide to use a questionnaire for this purpose, but will also allow for open-ended responses. Finally, the DDRC shall solicit confidential letters from relevant administrators and people external to the unit and/or the State of Hawai'i who know or should know how the D/D is performing. Each of these evaluators shall be asked to comment on the criteria established for the individual D/D review as well as on any others they believe are important.

The DDRC shall synthesize all of the information received and provide its best assessment of the D/D based upon it. Areas of concern shall be noted along with suggested methods for improvement. These written evaluations shall be sent to the appropriate VP by July 1,1997 (thereafter April 1).

In units where the Director reports to both a VP and a Dean (e.g. SOEST, and CTAHR), the Director being evaluated will send a copy of his/her self-assessment to the Dean at the same time it is sent to the DDRC. The Dean shall prepare an independent evaluation of the Director and forward this to the VP by July 1, 1997 (thereafter April 1).

VP Assessment and Recommendation

The VP shall make a written evaluation, taking into account the assessment by the DDRC. The written evaluation by the VP may summarize the DDRC report and/or may include additional information gathered by the VP. Between June and August, 1997 (thereafter, between April and June), the VP shall meet individually with the D/D to discuss the findings and the VP's recommendation concerning performance and areas for growth/improvement. The VP shall then finalize the written evaluation and provide a copy to the D/D. The VP shall also send a copy to the President and Chancellor. Finally, the VP shall transmit the evaluation to the Office of Human Resources for incorporation into the D/D's official personnel file. At the time the official evaluation is transmitted, copies of all working documents shall be destroyed.

Library

Dean Evaluation Procedures

The Faculty review of the Dean of Library Services is one component of the university program for review of college offices and officers. This component is directed toward providing constructive and systematic faculty evaluation of college deans and their administrative organizations and supplying faculty opinion for the Provost's evaluation of deans. The faculty evaluation process centers on three steps: a self-assessment by the Dean, a performance evaluation of the Dean, and provision for formal consultation involving the Dean, the Provost, and the college faculty.

1. Dean's Self-Assessment

The Dean will prepare a Self-Assessment Report dealing with the priorities, plans, and accomplishments of the Dean and his or her administrative organization. This report should take into consideration the responsibilities and qualities included in the job description used in the latest notice of vacancy for the position of Dean of Library Services. It also should provide information helpful to the consideration of areas noted below in the description of the performance evaluation. The report will be sent to the Dean Evaluation Committee which will review it and discuss it with the Dean. It then will be distributed to the library faculty.

2. Faculty Evaluation of the Dean

The faculty evaluation of the Dean and his or her administrative organization will consider such areas as:

- success in the development, articulation, and implementation of the library's mission statement and strategic plan
- quality of the library collections and library services, including such areas as public services, technical services, and automated services
- effectiveness of the various elements of the library administrative organization
- encouragement and support of faculty efforts related to professional practice; teaching; research, scholarship, or artistic activities; and service
- achievement of productive relationships with library faculty and staff, university faculty and administrative officers, students, state library leaders, and national library leaders
- commitment to and activities in the area of affirmative action
- scholarly and professional distinction
- other topics requested by the Provost

The faculty performance evaluation will be conducted by the Dean Evaluation Committee. This Committee will consists of five members, four members of the library faculty and a member of the non-library university faculty. The library faculty members will be elected by the tenured and tenure/track faculty. There will be an at-large representative as well as representatives from public services, technical services, and collections/automated services. The Assistance Directors will be ineligible to serve on this committee, and the election will be conducted by the officers of the Library Faculty. The four elected members will select the non-library university faculty member after consultation with the library faculty. The Committee will choose its own chair who will be a full participant in committee activities.

The Committee will collect information and evaluations from the library faculty and, as appropriate, from other sources such as library staff and administrators, university faculty and administrators, students, state and national library leaders, and other knowledgeable about the functioning and achievements of the library. All responses to the Committee will be treated as confidential correspondence.

The Committee will prepare a report that provides a summary of the findings of the Committee and an evaluation of the performance of the Dean and administrative organization. This report will be submitted to the Dean for a review for factual accuracy. The chair of the Committee will schedule a meeting of the Dean and the Committee to discuss the report.

3. Consultation with the Dean and the Provost

The report will be submitted to the Provost, and the chair of the Committee will schedule a meeting of the Committee chair, the Dean, and the Provost to discuss the report.

4. Report to the Library Faculty

A report describing the methodology used in the review will be provided to the faculty by the Committee. The Committee and the Provost will determine the appropriate format for reporting the results of the review itself to the library faculty.

5. Schedule

A review will be initiated by the Provost at least once every five years. Unless initiated earlier, the evaluation process will begin in the spring semester of the fourth year after a prior review or, in the case of a recently hired Dean, in the spring semester of the fourth year after the starting date of employment. Early in the semester, the chair of the Library Faculty will confirm with the Provost that a review will be initiated in the following year and conduct the election for the library faculty members of the Committee. By the end of the semester, these members should select the external member and the entire committee should choose its chair. The chair of the Committee will ask the Dean to prepare the Self-Assessment Report by the beginning of the fall semester. The review should be completed and the Committee's report finished by March 1.

DEANS' AND DIRECTORS' ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

In accordance with the rules and regulations of the Faculty Senate, the administrative performance of deans and directors must be reviewed within five years of their initial appointment and at least every following fifth year. This formal review affords a comprehensive assessment of administrative performance, and provides the dean or director with constructive feedback. The outcome of the formal, periodic review does not determine reappointment. Nor should it do so, since academic administrators serve at the pleasure of their vice chancellor, who may reconsider continuing their administrative appointments at any time. Rather, the formal review complements the annual assessment by the vice chancellor, providing a framework against which to examine various aspects of the dean's or director's administrative performance.

Administrative performance reviews should provide an accurate, thorough, and constructive assessment based upon information gathered in a timely manner with minimal disruption to the unit. The following information and the enclosed materials are intended to facilitate the review process. The information and sample materials are offered only as suggestions; the review committee is free to develop its own materials. However, a set of brief "instructions," drawn from the experience gained during the last few reviews, may make the process more efficient and effective.

The following sections of this document provide guidelines for conducting the administrative review of deans and directors.

Dean or Director's Self-Study

The dean or director under consideration will prepare a self-study, which will be submitted to the review committee at its first meeting. The self-study should:

1. provide the review committee with a brief overview of the dean's or director's administration, including the duties and responsibilities he/she was asked to undertake by the senior administration. The dean/director may wish to include information about management "style," successes, weaknesses, and disappointments.

2. address the concerns he/she has about the unit.

3. outline goals and accomplishments over the past five years.

4. enumerate the goals he/she has set for the next five years, and the means by which those goals will be reached.

5. comment on any concerns raised during the previous performance review (if applicable).

The dean or director also may wish to address other areas that will be examined by the review committee (see list under "CHARGE TO THE REVIEW COMMITTEE" below).

Dean or Director's Review Committee

Composition

"The review committee will consist of 5-9 voting members, depending on the size of the unit. No less than forty percent of the members shall be faculty from the unit of the dean under review elected by established unit procedures. The remainder shall be appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and shall include at least one student and one staff member from the unit of the dean under review and at least one member from outside the unit. In addition, a representative of the Office of Academic Affairs will be a non-voting ex-officio member of the review committee. The committee shall elect a chair from its voting members." Section 6.1.1. and Appendix 1 of the Faculty Sentate Rules and Regulations.

Charge

The review committee shall:

1. evaluate the performance of the dean or director since the last review took place (or in the case of a new dean or director, since he or she took office), and

2. present findings and recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the form of a written report.

In fulfilling these obligations, the committee is expected to review the dean's or director's record and performance over the period under consideration in both academic and administrative matters (although the dean's abilities and performance as a scholar are not part of the review). Strengths and weaknesses in the following areas may be examined:

1. Leadership
2. Provision of a climate that encourages scholarship, teaching and research
3. Medium- and long-range planning
4. Setting of academic and budgetary priorities
5. Affirmative action
6. Interactions with faculty, staff, senior administration, students, other Schools and faculties, and outside constituencies
7. Business management
8. Fund raising
9. Response to findings of earlier review
10. Representation of unit and institutional perspectives to internal and external constituencies
11. Any other relevant areas

The dean's or director's self-study and, where applicable, the summary of the last review committee's report, will be available to committee members at the first

meeting.

Procedures and Time-Frame

The period of time between the first meeting of the review committee and submission of the final report should not exceed 90 days.

The following tasks should be accomplished during the initial committee meeting:

1. Election of a chairperson.

2. Division of tasks among members, including responsibility for producing the written report.

3. Development of a timetable for the review which includes dates for, at least, the following:

   a. analysis and discussion of dean's or director's self-study (the committee may ask the administrator to submit additional information, if needed);

   b. completion of the canvass of and interviews with various constituent groups;

   c. committee discussion of canvass results;

   d. site visit;

   e. submission of draft written report to committee;

   f. submission of final report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 30 days of the site visit.

The Office of Academic Affairs will provide clerical assistance, postage and mailing. In addition, Academic Affairs will receive completed questionnaires and assist the committee in tabulating and/or summarizing responses.

Constituencies

In order to evaluate the dean's performance, the views of interested constituencies must form a major part of the review. Information should be solicited from the following:

1. Faculty
2. Students (undergraduate and graduate)
3. Classified and unclassified staff
4. Advisory Board members

5. Other Deans
6. Superiors

The committee also may wish to survey the following:

7. Professionals in the field
8. Alumni
9. Directors/heads of affiliated research institutions
10. Other affiliated centers and/or divisions such as placement centers, advising offices, and so forth
11. Any other special groups

The committee should encourage frank and open comments from those it consults. Signed questionnaires and letters are preferable, but respondents may wish to remain anonymous, and should be given that option.

It would be appropriate for the full committee or individual members to interview selected members of the constituencies and any individual who wishes to be heard. Careful notes should be taken of all interviews and should form part of the committee's permanent record.

ALL DOCUMENTATION AND INTERVIEWS MUST BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE.

Site Visit

In addition to the review of written documentation, the committee is to conduct a one to two day site visit. Such visits provide an opportunity to verify written documentation, gather additional data, and interview constituent groups and key individuals. The development of specific guidelines for the visit is the prerogative of the review committee. However, the committee should develop procedures which provide ample opportunity for interaction with constituents groups, particularly the faculty. The procedures should be minimally disruptive to the functioning of the unit.

Written Report

The committee's findings should be presented, in writing, in a form suitable for transmittal to the dean or director. A draft of the report should be presented to the full committee for discussion and approval before it is forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The committee's final report should give due weight to the dean's or director's strengths and contributions, while, at the same time, objectively outlining deficiencies. A recommendation on reappointment is not expected. While the specific format of the report is not delineated, the report should include an executive summary as well as the full report.

The report should reflect the views of all interested constituencies. However, the committee should bear in mind the inevitable conflicts that arise when hard decisions must be made. Since the audience for the report includes the administrator

undergoing review, any areas of concern should be presented in as constructive a manner as possible.

The report should be transmitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 30 days of the site visit. A summary of the review will be available to interested constituents through the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

SETTING EXPECTATIONS AND FINAL APPRAISAL FORM

OFFICER / DEAN / ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR

(Associate Vice President, Assistant Vice President, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean)

Employee Name: _____ Supervisor: _____

ID Number: _____ Period Covering: _____

Job Title: _____ Date of Review: _____

Division/Dept: _____ Section/Unit: _____

Expectation Setting Meeting Held and Job Priorities Discussed: _____ (Date)

_____ _____

Supervisor's Signature Employee's Signature

Midway Feedback Session Held: _____ (Date)

_____ _____

Supervisor's Signature Employee's Signature

Final Appraisal Meeting Held _____ (Date)

Please check one: The employee and supervisor are [_____ in agreement _____ not in agreement] with the performance appraisal results. If not agreed, area(s) of disagreement are indicated below:

_____ _____

Supervisor's Signature Employee's Signature

Reviewed by next higher level supervisor (or departmental designee):

_____ _____

Reviewer's Name (Please Print) Reviewer's Signature

Note: The employee's signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the performance appraisal results. The signature indicates only that the performance appraisal was held.

OVERALL RATING SCALE:

Outstanding	Exemplary performance in all areas of the job.
Exceeds Expectations	Surpasses the standards and established performance expectations in many important areas of the job.
Meets Expectations	Good performance. Consistently meets standards and established performance expectations in important areas of the job.
Below Expectations	Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas of the job; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
Unsatisfactory	Performance falls below expectations in many areas of the job. Substantial improvement critical.

These are the general rating categories. Specific expectations must be set by the supervisor and employee for each performance factor.

Instructions: From the list below, choose 4 - 6 of the most important performance factors for the evaluation of employee performance. Specific expectations must be developed for each factor and listed on this PRD form. Supplemental factors may be developed in addition to or in lieu of the factors listed below.

Goals and Objectives: The supervisor may also develop additional goals and objectives for employee performance. The goals or objectives should be listed on the form with specific action plans and deadlines or time frames for completion. The supervisor and employee should also discuss and record "Meets Expectations" levels of performance.

Suggested Performance Factors

- **LEADERSHIP AND MOTIVATION**
Creating and maintaining a productive environment; fostering a commitment for achieving University goals; setting a positive example for others to follow. Staffing: Planning and staffing the unit with the appropriate number and skills mix of employees; selecting a highly qualified and diverse workforce.

- **SETTING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**
Establishing appropriate objectives and priorities based on strategic goals of the University; communicating objectives and priorities to direct reports, units, and others; ensuring follow up and attainment of goals; updating objectives as needed.

- **ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT**
Striving to improve the University's performance by identifying areas in need of enhancement and initiating planned processes of change in those areas. Using Strategic Planning, Business Process Reengineering, and Continuous Quality Improvement to address those issues.

- **CUSTOMER SERVICE**
Ensuring that all reporting units understand and focus on the needs of internal and external customers; making a special effort to be responsive in meeting their needs and in building customer satisfaction.

- **PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**
Unit responsibilities: Ensuring that all employees within the unit have received a fair and equitable PRD evaluation conducted in compliance with all policies and procedures. Individual employees: Providing employees with frequent feedback about performance and attainment of goals; provide coaching; evaluating performance and conducting performance review discussions; identifying and supporting training and development needs.

- **MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES**
Administration: Keeping accurate records and documentation, processing necessary paperwork and organizing information. Resolving conflicts. Planning and Execution / Implementation: Developing strategies and work plans for accomplishing goals; organizing tasks in a logical sequence and identifying resources required. Management: Allocating assignments and providing direction to ensure that important research, teaching and/or service goals of the unit and/or College are accomplished. Responding to Work Demands: Working on multiple activities at the same time. Balancing the pressures from above with the requirements of the unit and/or College. Adapting to changing conditions in the internal and external environment.

- **PUBLIC RELATIONS**
Representing the University in a positive way to members of the University community and external groups. Functioning as a campus citizen. Taking a university perspective concerning issues and policies. Representing the university at events involving external constituencies.

- **COMMUNICATIONS**
Acting as a link between employees and higher management to communicate information and decisions, both in writing and verbally; keeping people in unit informed about issues important to them. Communicating the research, teaching and/or service goals of the unit and/or College to both internal and external constituencies.

- **PLANNING AND OPERATIONS**
Developing goals and strategic plans for the units and/or College. Contributing to recruitment, development and retention of faculty. Operating the unit and/or College in an efficient manner. Organization and Work Allocation: Organizing the work flow and relationships among people and functions in the unit; delegating work to make efficient use of resources and to develop people's capabilities; facilitating the flow of information among individuals and groups. Problem Solving: Identifying problems and analyzing causes; taking or recommending actions after evaluating alternative solutions; following up to ensure problems are actually corrected.

- **BUDGETING**
Making effective use of resources in accomplishing the teaching, research and/or service goals of the unit and/or College. Ensuring that the unit and/or College maintains fiscal responsibility. Developing and maintaining budgets for the unit based on strategic goals to be accomplished; monitoring status during year; recommending changes to budget when appropriate. Use of Resources: Making good use of resources, and not wasting time or material; looking for ways to reduce costs; staying within budgets allocated.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Outstanding	Exemplary performance in all areas of the factor
Exceeds Expectations	Surpasses the standards and established performance expectations in many important areas of the factor.
Meets Expectations	Good performance. Consistently meets standards and established performance expectations in important areas of the factor.
Below Expectations	Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas of the factor; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
Unsatisfactory	Performance falls below expectations in many areas of the factor. Substantial improvement critical.

1. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

_____

2. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

Outstanding	Exemplary performance in all areas of the factor.
Exceeds Expectations	Surpasses the standards and established performance expectations in many important areas of the factor.
Meets Expectations	Good performance. Consistently meets standards and established performance expectations in important areas of the factor.
Below Expectations	Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas of the factor; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
Unsatisfactory	Performance falls below expectations in many areas of the factor. Substantial improvement critical.

3. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

_____

4. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Outstanding	Exemplary performance in all areas of the factor.
Exceeds Expectations	Surpasses the standards and established performance expectations in many important areas of the factor.
Meets Expectations	Good performance. Consistently meets standards and established performance expectations in important areas of the factor.
Below Expectations	Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas of the factor; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
Unsatisfactory	Performance falls below expectations in many areas of the factor. Substantial improvement critical.

5. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

_____

6. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

Outstanding	Exemplary performance in all areas of the factor.
Exceeds Expectations	Surpasses the standards and established performance expectations in many important areas of the factor.
Meets Expectations	Good performance. Consistently meets standards and established performance expectations in important areas of the factor.
Below Expectations	Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas of the factor; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
Unsatisfactory	Performance falls below expectations in many areas of the factor. Substantial improvement critical

7. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

_____

8. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

Outstanding	Exemplary performance in all areas of the factor.
Exceeds Expectations	Surpasses the standards and established performance expectations in many important areas of the factor.
Meets Expectations	Good performance. Consistently meets standards and established performance expectations in important areas of the factor.
Below Expectations	Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas of the factor; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
Unsatisfactory	Performance falls below expectations in many areas of the factor. Substantial improvement critical.

9. **Factor / Goal / Objective:** _____

_____

Action Plan: _____

_____

Definition of "Meets Expectations"

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

Comments on Performance

Instructions: The supervisor must assign an overall rating to the employees's cumulative performance throughout the review cycle. The determination of the overall rating shall be consistent with the rating scale defined below.

OVERALL RATING:

Outstanding	Exemplary performance in all areas of the job.
Exceeds Expectations	Surpasses the standards and established performance expectations in many important areas of the job.
Meets Expectations	Good performance. Consistently meets standards and established performance expectations in important areas of the job.
Below Expectations	Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas of the job; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
Unsatisfactory	Performance falls below expectations in many areas of the job. Substantial improvement critical.

Outstanding ☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ **Meets Expectations** ☐ Below Expectations ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐

DEVELOPMENT PLANS

To be completed by employee and supervisor together using information from previous sections

MAJOR STRENGTHS:
In which performance factors/projects did the employee excel?

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT / ENHANCEMENT:
Which performance factors/projects are in need of improvement or enhancement?

ACTION PLANS:
What actions should be taken by the employee and/or supervisor to improve the employee's performance and help achieve goal(s) during the next performance period?

Action Plan	Time Frame
Employee:	
Supervisor:	

TRAINING PLANS:
List the training actions that will be taken to improve performance weaknesses in the current job or to develop additional employee skills.

REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

I. POLICY

It is the policy of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to conduct an annual review of each incumbent administrative officer. In addition, there will be a formal cumulative performance review at intervals not to exceed five years for the purpose of providing information to improve performance, recognize and reward outstanding performance, and determine whether the incumbent's administrative appointment should be continued. This policy shall apply to vice chancellors, deans, directors reporting to the chancellor or to a vice chancellor, and department chairs or heads. The chancellor may make this policy applicable to other administrative officers holding positions equivalent to those listed above.

A. Annual Reviews

Each administrative officer shall be reviewed annually by his or her immediate supervisor. The supervisor shall determine the nature and manner of conducting the review.

B. Cumulative Performance Reviews

Administrative positions differ in scope and responsibility and the procedures for cumulative performance reviews will vary accordingly. The cumulative performance review shall be conducted in accordance with the following principles, and standards of administrative performance delineated in the UNL Bylaws. These principles and standards will also apply to units other than academic units to the extent appropriate. The principles are:

1. The supervisor for each administrative officer subject to this policy shall establish the review period of each incumbent. Ordinarily the review period shall be five years, but review periods for initial appointments may be a shorter period. Individuals reporting to the incumbent should be made aware of the review period. In preparation for the review, the incumbent shall prepare a report to the supervisor of (a) the incumbent's past and current objectives and the success in achieving these objectives, and (b) the incumbent's future objectives and proposed plan for achieving these objectives. The report or a summary of the report will be made available to the faculty, students, and staff of the unit and to such others in a position to observe, evaluate, and offer information relevant to the incumbent's performance.

2. The supervisor shall solicit information and comments regarding the incumbent's performance from the faculty, students, and staff of the unit and from such others in a position to observe, evaluate, and offer information relevant to the incumbent's performance. Each person shall be encouraged, on the basis of those aspects of performance that they have directly observed, to suggest how the incumbent could improve performance, to give examples of outstanding performance, and to comment on whether the incumbent should be retained in his or her administrative office. In addition, the supervisor shall invite a representative committee of faculty[1] from the incumbent's unit to provide a written analysis of the incumbent's performance.

3. Once the supervisor has collected and reviewed all of the information with the incumbent, the supervisor shall meet with the unit's representative committee. In that meeting the supervisor shall review the procedures utilized in conducting the evaluation, the scope of the supervisor's inquiry including such information as the number of individuals from each group who participated in the evaluation, and a listing of any other additional sources of information used in evaluating the incumbent's performance. (Nothing in this section shall permit the supervisor to disclose the identity of any individual providing information or any information that may be confidential.)

   In addition, if the incumbent is reappointed, the supervisor shall discuss with the committee the goals and expectations established with the incumbent to be accomplished during the incumbent's next term. In the event that the incumbent is not reappointed, the supervisor shall discuss with the committee the supervisor's expectations for the incumbent's successor and the characteristics to be sought in the successor.

The evaluation and the decision whether or not to reappoint the incumbent to his or her administrative appointment is the responsibility of the supervisor. Reappointment of the incumbent following the periodic review requires a letter from the supervisor formalizing the action. The individuals who were invited to participate in the review will also be informed of the action.

---

[1]Ordinarily, in the review of a dean or department chair or head, the proper committee will be the elected faculty executive or advisory committee that normally acts on behalf of the faculty of that unit. For administrative officers with campus-wide responsibility, the proper committee is the Academic Senate Executive Committee or a standing advisory committee in the unit.

October, 1995

II. BACKGROUND FOR POLICY

The Bylaws of the Board of Regents establish for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln a system of shared governance and within that system delegates to various administrative officers the responsibility to administer the University. Administration is enhanced when clear objectives are established and the performance of administrative officers is measured against those goals and objectives.

The Bylaws of the Board of Regents and the UNL Bylaws place primary responsibility for the review and reappointment of an administrative officer on his or her immediate supervisor. The Bylaws of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln establish standards of administrative performance (UNL Bylaw 2.1.2) and provide that administrative officers of the campus "shall be appointed for a stated term" (UNL Bylaw 2.2.2), and that such officer shall "undergo annual evaluations of performance conducted by the officer's immediate supervisor" (UNL Bylaw 2.3.2.1). In addition, UNL Bylaw 2.3.2.2 requires each administrative program to be evaluated every five years and goes on to provide: "Normally, this evaluation should occur in the final year of the term specified in the appointment of the administrator."

UNL has implemented these Bylaws by conducting annual reviews of administrative officers. Although annual reviews provide the opportunity for frequent exchange regarding an administrative officer's short-term performance, administrative success or failure in achieving longer-term objectives can only be measured over a longer period. Thus, the addition of a more intense review of an administrative officer's performance is appropriate when it is necessary to decide whether that officer should be reappointed to an additional term.

FACULTY EVALUATION OF DEAN — LIBRARIES

Solicit other's opinions on areas impacting college's programs, goals and objectives?

Effectively manage routine financial and budgetary affairs of the college?

Commit college resources and provide support for faculty research activities?

Exhibit a positive and professional image of the college and the university to alumni and other external constituencies?

Effectively make contacts that could result in private funding for the college?

Effectively articulate college goals and objectives to internal and external constituents?

Utilize input from a variety of sources in the college-level planning decision making processes?

Commit college resources and provide support for faculty teaching activities?

Commit college resources for professional service and outreach activities?

Provide for faculty involvement in the governance of the college?

Promote racial and ethnic diversity through curriculum and program development?

Effectively solicit a variety of external resources for the college?

Communicate college vision and processes effectively with the faculty?

Delegate responsibility and authority appropriately?

Promote racial and ethnic diversity in hiring practices?

Respond to the needs of constituents in Nebraska/

Encourage and support the faculty to seek and write grant proposals?

Promote gender equity through curriculum development?

Celebrate the accomplishments and work of the college?

Create an effective atmosphere for the achievement of goals within the college?

Promote gender equity in hiring practices?

Support high standards for faculty, staff and students?

Celebrate and reward outstanding individual and program level excellence?

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED ON ANOTHER SHEET.

STAFF EVALUATION OF DEAN — LIBRARIES

Solicit staff opinion on areas impacting their programs, goals and objectives?

Effectively manage routine financial and budgetary affairs of the college?

Exhibit a positive and professional image of the college and the university of alumni and other external constituencies?

Effectively articulate college goals and objectives to internal and external constituents?

Utilize input from a variety of sources in the college-level planning decision making processes?

Support the staff in career development?

Promotes racial and ethnic diversity in the college?

Bring new ideas before the college for consideration?

Delegate responsibility and authority appropriately?

Promote racial and ethnic diversity in hiring practices?

Respond to the needs of constituents in Nebraska?

Communicate college vision and processes effectively with staff?

Respond to formal and informal faculty and student appeals in a timely and constructive manner?

Celebrate the accomplishments and work of the college?

Create an effective atmosphere for the achievement of goals within the college?

Promote gender equity in hiring practices?

Support high standards for staff?

Celebrate and reward outstanding individual and program level excellence?

Develop appropriate staff evaluation processes?

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED ON ANOTHER SHEET.

Dean Evaluation
Open-Ended Questions and Comments

1. Please list the strengths of the dean in his/her work this past year.

2. What are some specific areas in which the dean could engage in the future in a continued search for excellence?

3. How would you rate the overall performance of the dean? Circle one.

Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent

Signature _____
(Optional)

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA – LINCOLN

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

DEAN/ASSOCIATE DEAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REVIEW

1. The Dean/Associate Dean's Progress Review committee will be elected in March, to take office in April.

   a. The General Library Faculty will elect one member.

   b. The Library Professional Staff Advisory Council (LPSAC) will supervise election of two members from the staff.

   c. The Head of Administrative Services will serve as an ex-officio member.

2. By April 1, the Dean and Associate Dean will place a packet on reserve containing an up-to-date resume, statement of objectives (if available), and the most recent General Library Annual Report.

3. The Head of Administrative Services will distribute assessment forms to all library faculty and staff by April 1.

4. Completed assessment forms must be signed and returned to the Head of Administrative Services by the end of the third week of April. Anonymous input will not be accepted.

5. The Progress Review Committee will tally the assessment forms.

6. The Committee will present the results at a meeting of the General Library Faculty, to which LPSAC will be invited. The Dean and Associate Dean will not be present during the discussion of their own review.

7. The Committee will summarize the General Library Faculty meeting discussion and write progress reviews for the Dean and Associate Dean.

8. The Committee will meet with the Dean and Associate Dean to present the progress reviews.

9. The Library Management Group (LMG) will meet in closed session no later than April 30 to write its own progress reviews for the Dean and Associate Dean. The Dean and Associate Dean will not be present during discussions of their own review.

10. LMG will give copies of the progress reviews to the Dean and Associate Dean. The Dean will also receive a copy of the Associate Dean's review.

11. The Committee and LMG will jointly prepare a summary of the Dean's progress review and will forward that summary to the Dean and the Provost by May 7.

12. The Head of Administrative Services will destroy the individual assessment forms one month after LMG completes its report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASSESSMENT FORM
DEAN OF LIBRARY SERVICES

Please evaluate :_____

Excellent	Good	Sat	Needs Work	Unsat	No Opinion
5	4	3	2	1	0

I. LIBRARIANSHIP

- Leadership
- Administrative effectiveness
- Collegiality
- Communication skills
- Understanding new developments in academic librarianship
- Innovation
- Effective use of resources
- Sharing needed information
- Working relationships with:
  - a. University Administration
  - b. Non-library faculty
  - c. Library faculty
  - d. Library staff

- Promotion of good relations:
  - a. with other libraries
  - b. with professional groups

61

- Knowledge of library operations
- Accessibility
- Success in meeting personal goals
- Responsiveness to service needs

Excellent	Good	Sat	Needs Work	Unsat	No Opinion
5	4	3	2	1	0

II. RESEARCH

Research, scholarship, and creative works

Excellent	Good	Sat	Needs Work	Unsat	No Opinion
5	4	3	2	1	0

III. SERVICE

- Service to the University
- Service to the community
- Service to the profession

IV. COMMENTS

If you have given this person a 1 or a 5 in any category, please explain. (Please use additional pages if needed.

Signed:_____Date_____

Return to Dean's
Return to Policies

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Copyright © 1995 The University of New Mexico.
See our Standard Disclaimer and Copyright Information Page.
Comments to cwairal@unm.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

08/05/97 14:51:17

REPORT

OF

SENATE-CHANCELLOR COMMITTEE TO IMPLEMENT

A PROGRAM OF

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS

PREAMBLE

Following the recommendation of the previous Senate-Chancellor committee, this committee recommends the institution of reviews for administrators at five year intervals. The committee further recommends that new administrators be evaluated after eighteen months, as is common in the non-academic world. The primary objective of the evaluation is to recommend whether or not the administrator should be retained in the position for an additional five years or, in the case of new administrators, for the remainder of the first term of five years.

The purpose of the five-year review is to complement the routine annual reviews carried out by each administrator's direct supervisor. The primary objective is to recommend whether or not the administrator should be retained in the position for an additional five years. An additional goal is the development of the administrators that are retained. It is recognized that all individuals are capable of improvement regardless of how well they are performing their duties.

The review process is to be supervised by a Standing Committee that is advisory to the Chancellor. The duties of the Standing Committee will be to appoint the Review Committees for each administrator, to supervise and refine the review process as it is developed over the next few years, and to oversee the extent of compliance with recommendations of the Review Committees.

A secondary goal of this process is the improvement of the administrators who continue to serve. Throughout its proceedings the committee has worked on the premise that this new review process will not replace the annual reviews of administrators that are expected to be carried out by their immediate supervisors. The committee recognizes that these annual reviews serve an important developmental goal in allowing the administrator and the supervisor to monitor developing problems and recognize successful performance on a regular basis. It also recognizes that these annual reviews may not be conducted on a regular basis currently by all administrative supervisors. It is important that the administration of the University ensure that such reviews are conducted in a regular, timely and objective manner. The committee also recommends that the university intensify the number of courses it offers for administrators and makes them available to more administrators. They should be made available to all new administrators.

The committee has recognized throughout that the Review Process marks a watershed in administration - faculty relations and that it is of great importance to the future development of the University. It has tried throughout to generate a policy document that will engender a spirit of collegiality between faculty and administrators in working for the common good. It realizes that the policy developed has to serve a dual function, encompassing the short-term needs of a transition in campus attitudes with the long term needs of a continuing policy embodying mutual trust. In some respects the needs are in conflict with one another. When a greater level of trust has been engendered some monitoring procedures will be obsolete and could be discarded.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. REVIEW PROGRAM

1.1 All administrators at the level of Department Head, or equivalent, and above will be reviewed during the tenth semester[1] in office.

1.2 All administrators (including acting administrators) will be reviewed during the fourth semester after appointment to a new position.

1.3 The review process will be overseen by a Standing Committee of seven. The functions of the Standing Committee will be to oversee and refine the review process, to appoint the Review Committees for each administrator and to monitor progress on specific recommendations.

1.4 Five members of the Standing Committee will be distinguished senior faculty appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate, the remaining two members being appointed by the Chancellor. The chair of the Standing Committee will be appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate.

1.5 The term of office of members of the Standing Committee will be three years and the appointments staggered to assure a reasonable rotation.

1.6 For the Standing Committee and the Review Committees, faculty are defined strictly as those faculty who do not hold administrative appointments at the department head level and above.

1.7 Records will be kept, and the Standing Committee activated every semester in a timely manner, by the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor.

Footnote
1. Throughout this document the word "semester" refers to fall and spring semesters and excludes summers.

2. REVIEW PROCEDURES

2.1 Review committees for each administrator and the committee chairs will be appointed by the Standing Committee.

2.2 Review committee appointments will be made in the semester prior to that in which the review is to be conducted.

2.3 Opinions and information will be gathered primarily by questionnaire. All committees will provide adequate time for direct testimony by faculty and all other constituencies.

2.4 All proceedings will be fully confidential and anonymity retained except when agreed to in advance by a respondent.

2.5 All reviews will begin with the preparation of a self-study document[1] by the administrator being reviewed. An up-to-date curriculum vitae should be attached as an appendix to the document.

2.6 The second step in the review process will be a meeting between the review committee, the administrator under review and the administrator's direct supervisor to discuss the constituencies to be surveyed. At that time attention will also be paid to the refinement of the actual questionnaires to be used in the review process[2].

2.7 Constituencies include faculty, other administrators, staff, graduate & undergraduate students, alumni and others. The faculty and some part of the student body will always be surveyed.

2.8 Alongside the review of the administrator, a review should be conducted of the organization of the office. This review will be used later as background information during the review of the administrator's associates and assistants.

2.9 The Report of each Review Committee will be completed by the tenth week of the semester in which the review is conducted. The report will include

(a) the questionnaire with mean responses shown[3]
(b) a totally anonymous summary of interview comments
(c) general observations and recommendations

Footnotes

1. see Appendix A
2. see Appendix B
3. When a sufficient number of reviews have been conducted, statistical data for administrators in a similar position, by college and/or campus where appropriate, should also be given.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. REPORTING AND FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

3.1 The Report will be sent to the direct supervisor of the administrator being reviewed, with a copy being sent to the administrator under review. Shortly thereafter a discussion of the report will be held between the review committee and the administrator's direct supervisor.

3.2 (a) For an administrator being reappointed, a Plan of Action will be developed by the direct supervisor in consultation with the administrator being reviewed and the chair of the Review Committee.

(b) For an administrator not continuing for another term, for whatever reason, notification of the action will be forwarded to the Standing Committee and the Review Committee.

3.3 The Plan of Action will be forwarded to the Chancellor for review and approval in all cases but those of Vice-Chancellors, when it will be forwarded to the President. Copies of the Report and the Approved Plan of Action will be forwarded to the Standing Committee. The Review Committee will then be asked to prepare a single sheet summary of the Plan of Action.

3.4 The Report and the Summarized Plan of Action will be retained in a file by the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor and will be accessible to the University community and the general public in a manner consistent with the laws of the State of Tennessee[1]. It is strongly recommended that each administrator share the report and the Summarized Plan of Action with the relevant faculty. The detailed Plan of Action will be maintained in the file of the administrator's direct supervisor.

3.5 A Progress Report will be submitted to the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor by the direct supervisor eighteen months after the filing of the Plan of Action. Copies will be sent to the Chair of the Standing Committee and the Chair of the Review Committee[2].

3.6 In a case of unsatisfactory progress in the opinion of either the Chair of the Standing Committee or the Chair of the Review Committee, either should request an interview with the Chancellor and/or call a meeting of the original review committee. In the case of the Chancellor the interview will be with the President[2].

Footnotes

1. Two members of the committee dissent from this recommendation and prefer that the file be a closed file.
2. One member of the committee objects to sections 3.5 and 3.6

4. REVIEW COMMITTEE STRUCTURES

All committee members will be faculty who do not hold any appointments at the level of Department Head and above, unless specifically stated otherwise. In all cases the chair of the review committee will be a faculty member.

The reasoning here has been to follow the appointment structure currently utilized in Graduate School reviews with some modifications for administrators above the level of Department Head. It is believed that this procedure will eliminate the effects of any protectionism. It should also ensure a clear and open response from respondents and minimize the possibility of recriminations.

4.1 Department Heads

Review Committees will be comprised of three faculty from outside departments.

4.2 Academic Deans

Review Committees will be comprised of five members, one of whom may be a Department Head. At least three will be from outside the college, the chair being appointed from amongst those three.

4.3 Associate/Assistant Deans

Review Committees will have three members. At least two will be from outside the college, the chair being appointed from amongst those two.

4.4 The Chancellor

The Review Committee will have seven members, of which one should be a Department Head and one a Dean. The chair of the committee will be a faculty member.

4.5 Vice-Chancellors

Review Committees will be composed of five members, one of whom may be an academic Dean or Associate Dean.

The following recommendations are made for certain specific positions:

1. Academic Affairs. One member should be a department head.
2. Computing & Telecommunications. One or two members should have significant knowledge of computing.
3. Business & Finance. One or two members should be from the College of Business.
4. Development & Alumni Affairs. One member should be a department head.

4.6 Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellors

Review committees will be composed of five members, one of whom may be a Dean, Associate Dean or Department Head.

It is recommended that attention to be paid to the specific functions of the administrators in terms of the expertise and experience of the committee members to be appointed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4.7 Directors, Non-academic Deans and Other Categories

Review committees will be composed of three or five members who have no direct association with the administrative function, one of whom may be an appropriate level academic administrator. The decision on the size of any particular committee will be made by the Standing Committee.

It is recommended that attention be paid to the specific functions of the administrators in terms of the expertise and experience of the committee members to be appointed.

5. REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

Some specimens of the questionnaires[1], which contain essential specific questions that must be asked during the review process, are attached as part of Appendix B. They have been formulated specifically for use with faculty and other administrators, but are also appropriate for use by students, alumni and others. The response category NB permits questions inappropriate for certain responding groups to be ignored as necessary. Questionnaires for administrators with restricted job functions will differ from those attached in that an additional sheet of specific questions of relevance to the job function may also be helpful.

It is recognized that each specific Review Committee has the responsibility of ensuring that the questionnaire they use contains relevant specific questions not listed on the sheets of Appendix B. Removal of any of the questions listed in the sheets of Appendix B would have to be justified beforehand with the Standing Committee.

Footnotes

1. The questionnaires have been devised after considering (a) those used during the review of selected Deans three years ago, (b) those devised recently by the UT branch of the AAUP, and (c) comments on the AAUP forms from administrators. Also foremost in our considerations was the need for an effective review process which was also anonymous and fair to all concerned. It is believed that the detailed questionnaires ensure that responses are serious, well thought-out and fair to those being reviewed. Respondents have the option of signing Sheet 5, if they wish to have an interview with the Review Committee.

6. SCHEDULE

There are two schedules to be followed[1], one for all administrators and one for new administrators.

(a) The principles to be used in the scheduling of the five-year review process are as follows:

1. The process will be scheduled so that the task is spread evenly over a five-year period (ten semesters).

2. For each class of administrator the order will be that of longevity in the position. [For example, there are five Vice-Chancellors; they would be reviewed one per year in the order of time in office, the Chancellor being reviewed in the fifth year of office. There are fifteen academic deans; three would be reviewed each academic year, the order being determined by the time in office.]

3. Associate and assistant administrators in any office should be reviewed during the year following the review of their direct supervisor. The organization of the office will be reviewed at the same time as the direct supervisor, so that the associates and assistants can be reviewed in the context of the limitations of the office organization.

(b) In the case of the review of administrators appointed to new positions the schedule is self-explanatory, namely that they will be reviewed after three semesters in office. They will be reviewed again on the regular five-year schedule during the tenth semester in office.

Footnote
1. The schedules are in the process of being prepared and may be available for the October 1992 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

APPENDIX A

Self-study Document for Administrators: Guidelines

Prepare a self-study document in which you respond individually to each of the following areas:

1. Write a description of your position including all of the major areas of responsibility it entails.

2. How is the unit organized to carry out the major areas of responsibility ?

3. Describe your management style. How do you reach decisions concerning the allocation of fiscal and personnel resources within the unit?

4. What role does the faculty play in the governance of the unit?

5. Describe how you interact with the various constituencies of the unit within the university; in the academic world; in the community; nationally and internationally.

6. Describe how you continue your academic and professional development despite the demands of your administrative responsibilities.

Attach a recent copy of the curriculum vitae to the study.

APPENDIX B

This appendix contains some of the questionnaires that have been designed by the committee for use during the evaluation process. They contain questions that the committee believes essential to all or most administrators. The exact form of any question may be modified by professional psychometricians prior to final approval of the questionnaire by the Review Committee and the Standing Committee. Justification for removal of any of the mandated questions must be made by the Review Committee to the Standing Committee prior to change. The Review Committee may wish to add extra questions through the use of a sheet entitled "Specific Job Functions" if deemed necessary.

The specific style of all questions on the Questionnaire, relevant to its computerized evaluation, will be considered by the aforementioned professionals, who will interact with the committees.

The Questionnaires have been modified from the one designed for Deans to be specific to the other classes of administrator being reviewed. In the case of administrators with specific or restricted job functions other questions will be appropriate and should be added through the use of the "Specific Job Functions" sheet . It will be the task of the Standing Committee and the particular Review Committee to finalize the questionnaires to be used in each case.

Attached are the questionnaires for the following administrators:

1. Department Heads
2. Academic Deans
3. The Chancellor

Several others have been formulated along the lines of those provided, but are not attached.

Please note that pages 4 and 5 are common to all questionnaires and have been provided only for the Department Head questionnaire.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

FACULTY EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC DEANS

1 - poor; 2 - fair; 3 - adequate; 4 - good; 5 - excellent
NB - no basis for an answer

1. PERSONAL SKILLS

Treats individuals with dignity and respect	
(a) faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) support staff	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) graduate students	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(d) undergraduate students	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Shows no racial or ethnic bias	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Shows no gender bias	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Shows no sexual orientation bias	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Is accessible to individuals	
(a) faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) support staff	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) graduate students	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(d) undergraduate students	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Listens to constructive criticism	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Responds positively to constructive criticism	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Effectively mediates disputes between	
(a) faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) faculty and students	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) faculty and support staff	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(d) faculty & dept.heads	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Serves as a role model to faculty through	
(a) own professional development	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) tolerance of other opinions	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) receptiveness to comments	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(d) generating research funding	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(e) generating scholarly/creative work	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(f) response to student evaluations	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(g) interest in classroom teaching	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Fosters a spirit of collegiality	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Successfully articulates to the community	
(a) goals of the unit	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) needs of the unit	1 2 3 4 5 NB
OVERALL RATING OF PERSONAL SKILLS	1 2 3 4 5

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE
FACULTY EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC DEANS
2. MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

courages faculty input in administrative matters	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Encourages democratic forms of decision-making	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Encourages faculty input in budgetary decisions	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Has developed an effective strategic plan in cooperation with	
(a) faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) dept. heads	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Has negotiated departmental goals for achievement of strategic objectives	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Effectively reviews individual growth and achievements	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Adequately rewards achievement within the means available	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Provides incentives for faculty development (a) teaching	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) research	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) public service	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Provides adequate incentives for junior/untenured faculty	
(a) teaching	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) research	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) public service	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Encourages effective work load policies for	
(a) tenured faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) untenured faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Contributes positively to the improvement of faculty morale	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Effectively & adequately responds to	
(a) complaints/comments by faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) discontent within depts.	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) reviews of dept. heads	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(d) graduate school reviews	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Manages resources effectively (a) personnel	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) monetary	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) facilities	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Maintains effective relations with	
(a) same-level administrators	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) direct superior	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) upper level administrators	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(d) alumni	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(e) business/community leaders	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(f) professional peers	1 2 3 4 5 NB
(g) department heads	1 2 3 4 5 NB
OVERALL RATING OF MANAGEMENT ABILITIES	1 2 3 4 5

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE
FACULTY REVIEW OF ACADEMIC DEANS
3. LEADERSHIP ABILITY

Promotes affirmative action goals in recruiting		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Promotes racial/ethnic sensitivity in the classroom		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Promotes racial/ethnic sensitivity in the unit		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Promotes gender sensitivity in the classroom		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Promotes gender sensitivity in the unit		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Actively pursues the acquisition of new financial resources	(a) internally	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(b) externally from governmental agencies	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(c) externally from business interests	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Encourages collegiality and interactive research by personal example	(a) within the unit	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(b) across units	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(c) with other UT campuses	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(d) with other universities	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(e) internationally	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Encourages collegiality and interactive research among the faculty	(a) within the unit	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(b) across units	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(c) with other UT campuses	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(d) with other universities	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(e) internationally	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Effectively delegates responsibility	(a) to faculty committees	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(b) to senior faculty	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(c) to assoc./asst. deans	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Does not defer major decisions to dept. heads		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Associate/assistant deans are adequate	(a) in number	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(b) in professional standing	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(c) in political/personal skills	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Actively pursues the recruitment of students		
(a) undergraduates of high quality		1 2 3 4 5 NB
(b) U.S. graduate students of high quality		1 2 3 4 5 NB
(c) foreign graduate students of high quality		1 2 3 4 5 NB
(d) minority students		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Encourages effective advising	(a) of undergraduate students	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(b) of graduate students	1 2 3 4 5 NB
	(c) by personal example	1 2 3 4 5 NB
Serves as a role model by demonstrating ethical behavior and decision making		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Demonstrates creativity in the development of new initiatives		1 2 3 4 5 NB
Has a sense of vision for the future		1 2 3 4 5 NB
OVERALL EVALUATION OF LEADERSHIP QUALITY		1 2 3 4 5

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS • THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC DEANS 1994-95

This is an evaluation of

Please indicate your response to the following items by circling the appropriate number.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No basis for Evaluation
1. Provides forward-looking leadership for the Library.	5	4	3	2	1	0
2. Exhibits integrity in administering the Library.	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Is effective in achieving goals.	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. Communicates effectively with faculty.	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Utilizes input from an appropriate variety of sources in decision making.	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Deals fairly with complaints.	5	4	3	2	1	0
7. Is effective in representing the Library to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors.	5	4	3	2	1	0
8. Makes wise personnel decisions.	5	4	3	2	1	0
9. Is committed to cultural diversity.	5	4	3	2	1	0
10. Is committed to gender equity.	5	4	3	2	1	0
11. Promotes high academic standards.	5	4	3	2	1	0
12. Places an appropriate emphasis on instructional activity.	5	4	3	2	1	0
13. Places an appropriate emphasis on research/creative activity.	5	4	3	2	1	0
14. Places an appropriate emphasis on service/outreach activity.	5	4	3	2	1	0
15. Creates a supportive environment for professional development.	5	4	3	2	1	0
16. Is effective in managing Library resources.	5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Is effective in fund-raising for the Library.	5	4	3	2	1	0
18. Overall, I am pleased with the performance of the Dean.	5	4	3	2	1	0

If you wish to make additional comments, write or type them on the back of this sheet. Please return this form in the envelope provided or deliver it to the Office of Institutional Research, 600 Dunford Hall, CAMPUS 4065, by April 14, 1995. Thank you!

Washington State University
Social and Economic Sciences Research Center

Wilson Hall 133
Pullman, WA 99164-4014
509-335-1511
FAX 509-335-0116

April 9, 1996

Washington State University has a policy of conducting periodic intensive evaluations of its principal officers. , Director of the WSU Libraries, is completing her fifth year at Washington State University. An ad hoc committee has been established to review her performance and effectiveness in her current position.

We are contacting all Library and related faculty and staff, plus a random sample of other faculty and students. It is important that as many people as possible respond to give a representative view of the Director's performance.

The survey is being conducted through the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC) at WSU, which is responsible for tabulating the results. To ensure that all responses remain anonymous and confidential, no identifying information is requested and all completed questionnaires will be seen only by SESRC personnel. It will not be possible for anyone to link a particular questionnaire or response to the person making it.

Please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it **by May 1, 1996** in the enclosed envelope to the SESRC. If you are on-campus, you can return it through WSU's interdepartmental mail system. If you are off-campus, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your use.

If you have questions about the survey, please call the SESRC at 335-8396 and ask for
We thank you in advance for your response to this request.

Sincerely,

Study Director

77

Library Faculty

Library Staff

and

Director's Council

Questionnaire

For Review of the Director of the WSU Libraries

It is the policy of Washington State University to involve members of the faculty and staff in the periodic review of deans and directors, a process which is advisory to the Provost. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your appraisal of Director performance. The Director's vitae, statement of accomplishments, and committee appointments are available for your review in each library's main office. All questions should be considered with care. Comments are welcome and encouraged. Responses to this questionnaire are being collected by the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC), so that complete anonymity is assured. Please do not put your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please insert it in the enclosed envelope. If you are located on the WSU-Pullman campus, please drop the envelope in the WSU mail system. If you're located off-campus, a pre-stamped return envelope has been provided so that you may return the questionnaire by first-class mail. All questionnaires must be received by May 1, 1996.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VISION

I. Please rate Director on the following aspects of her **vision for the WSU Libraries** (that is, her concept of which library services are required to meet the needs of a multi-campus, land-grant university in the future). (*Please circle the number of your answer.*)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
A. Evaluating future needs of the WSU Libraries (such as space and equipment requirements, trends in patron usage, and changes in media services)	4	3	2	1	0
B. Creating an appropriate vision for the WSU Libraries	4	3	2	1	0
C. Creating a strategic plan for satisfying future needs	4	3	2	1	0

D. Please comment on Director ability to anticipate needs and opportunities and then develop an appropriate plan. *Written comments will be given careful consideration and will be kept confidential.*

LEADERSHIP

II. Please rate Director on the following aspects of her **leadership of the WSU Libraries**. By leadership, we mean the ability to motivate others to support and/or implement the vision, mission, and goals of the WSU Libraries. (*Please circle the number of your answer.*)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
A. Commitment to high service standards and excellence	4	3	2	1	0
B. Integrity and effectiveness in dealing with people	4	3	2	1	0
C. Leadership in recruiting excellent library personnel	4	3	2	1	0
D. Leadership in developing and retaining excellent library personnel	4	3	2	1	0
E. Inspiring a sense of common purpose and teamwork within the WSU Libraries	4	3	2	1	0
F. Leadership in fund raising	4	3	2	1	0
G. WSU Library progress toward achieving their vision and goals	4	3	2	1	0
H. Director overall leadership of the WSU Libraries	4	3	2	1	0

I. Please comment on Director leadership ability. *Written comments will be given careful consideration and will be kept confidential.*

ADMINISTRATION

III. Please rate Director or the WSU Libraries on the following aspects of **administration.** By administration, we mean the development and implementation of policies and procedures needed for effective and efficient operation of the WSU Libraries. (*Please circle the number of your answer.*)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
A. Responsiveness of the WSU Libraries to user needs	4	3	2	1	0
B. Sensitivity of Library policies and procedures to user needs	4	3	2	1	0
C. Appropriateness of Director allocation of Library resources (space, funds, personnel, equipment, etc.)	4	3	2	1	0
D. The work environment within the WSU Libraries (judging from morale, turnover, etc.)	4	3	2	1	0
E. How well the major project of moving into the New Holland Addition was administered under Director	4	3	2	1	0
F. Sensitivity toward diversity issues	4	3	2	1	0
G. Ability to evaluate and improve Library operations	4	3	2	1	0
H. Confidence in and respect of Library personnel (i.e., administrators, faculty, staff, and student workers)	4	3	2	1	0
I. Ability to resolve personnel issues and/or disputes	4	3	2	1	0
J. Objectivity of evaluation of faculty and staff performance	4	3	2	1	0
K. Respect for lines of authority	4	3	2	1	0
L. Ability as an arbitrator, mediator, and consensus builder	4	3	2	1	0
M. Decision-making ability	4	3	2	1	0
N. Understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of your division	4	3	2	1	0
O. Support of division administrators (e.g., in making difficult but necessary decisions, etc.)	4	3	2	1	0
P. The overall personnel policies and procedures of the WSU Libraries	4	3	2	1	0
Q. The overall operation of the WSU Libraries	4	3	2	1	0

R. Please comment on Director administrative ability. *Written comments will be given careful consideration and will be kept confidential.*

COMMUNICATION

IV. Please rate Director on the following aspects of **communication.** By communication, we mean a two-way process involving sharing information, listening, and understanding. (*Please circle the number of your answer.*)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
A. Communication of the needs, concerns, interests, and accomplishments of the WSU Libraries within WSU	4	3	2	1	0
B. Advocacy for the WSU Libraries to WSU Administration	4	3	2	1	0
C. Director representation of the WSU Libraries to state and federal officials.	4	3	2	1	0
D Responsiveness to inquiries, requests, and problems	4	3	2	1	0
E. Openness with which Director conducts the affairs of the WSU Libraries	4	3	2	1	0
F. Director accessibility	4	3	2	1	0
G. How well Director listens to and understands the concerns, suggestions, and ideas of Library personnel	4	3	2	1	0
H. How effective and clear the organizational routes for communication are within the WSU Libraries	4	3	2	1	0
I. Direction and feedback Director provides to Library personnel	4	3	2	1	0
J. Director encouragement of others to express their opinion, even when it differs from the Director's	4	3	2	1	0
K. Advocacy for your division or unit	4	3	2	1	0

L. Please comment on Director communication ability. *Written comments will be given careful consideration and will be kept confidential.*

EFFECTIVENESS

V. Please rate the WSU Libraries' **effectiveness**. By effectiveness, we mean how well the WSU Libraries support the University's mission of teaching, research, and service.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
A. How well the WSU Libraries meet the needs of undergraduate students	4	3	2	1	0
B. How well the WSU Libraries meet the needs of graduate and professional students	4	3	2	1	0
C. How well the WSU Libraries meet the needs of faculty	4	3	2	1	0
D. How well the WSU Libraries provide access to the collection through the online system (Griffin)	4	3	2	1	0
E. How well the WSU Libraries provide access to bibliographic and other databases	4	3	2	1	0
F. Promptness and accuracy with which library materials are re-shelved	4	3	2	1	0
G. How well the WSU Libraries provide access to materials through interlibrary loan and document delivery	4	3	2	1	0
H. Adequacy of the WSU Libraries' collection of books, journals, and other library materials	4	3	2	1	0
I. The condition in which library materials are preserved and maintained	4	3	2	1	0

J. Please comment on the WSU Libraries' overall effectiveness. *Written comments will be given careful consideration and will be kept confidential.*

_____

_____

_____

VI. SUMMARY QUESTIONS

Written comments will be given careful consideration and will be kept confidential.
Comments may be handwritten on this page or typed pages may be attached.

A. Please comment on the WSU Libraries and their ability to serve the WSU community.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Please comment on strengths and weaknesses as Director of the WSU Libraries.

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Would you rate Director overall performance as Director of the WSU Libraries as . . .

- EXCELLENT ❑
- GOOD ❑
- FAIR ❑
- POOR ❑
- Don't Know ❑

D. Compared with the condition of the Libraries five years ago, how would you rate the current condition of the WSU Libraries?

- MUCH IMPROVED ❑
- SOMEWHAT IMPROVED ❑
- ABOUT THE SAME ❑
- SOMEWHAT WORSE ❑
- MUCH WORSE ❑
- Don't Know ❑

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

VII. Responses to these questions will be summarized and presented in group form. All questionnaire responses are anonymous, and results will be presented in such a way that individual persons cannot be identified.

A. How closely do you interact with the Director's Office?

- VERY CLOSELY ❑
- SOMEWHAT CLOSELY ❑
- NOT AT ALL CLOSELY ❑

B. Are you ...

- MALE ❑
- FEMALE ❑

C. What PRIMARY race or ethnic group do you consider yourself to be?

- BLACK or AFRICAN AMERICAN ❑
- NATIVE AMERICAN or INDIAN ❑
- ASIAN or PACIFIC ISLANDER ❑
- WHITE or CAUCASIAN ❑
- HISPANIC or OF SPANISH ORIGIN ❑
- OTHER ETHNICITY(IES) ❑

_____

D. Please check the answer which BEST applies to you:

- MEMBER OF THE DIRECTOR'S COUNCIL ❑
- LIBRARY FACULTY ❑
- LIBRARY STAFF ❑

E. How many years of service do you have with the WSU Libraries? _____

F. Is your primary workplace located in Pullman?

- YES ❑
- NO ❑

G. Which one of the following MOST CLOSELY describes your position with WSU Libraries?

- TECHNICAL SERVICES/LIBRARY SYSTEMS ❑
- PUBLIC SERVICES (includes Circulation, Reference, IRL, MASC, MMS) ❑
- BOTH TECHNICAL SERVICES AND PUBLIC SERVICES ❑
- ADMINISTRATION ❑

85

Is there anything else you would like to tell us concerning Director administration and management of the WSU Libraries? Any comments that you think may be useful will be appreciated.

Thank you very much for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. We believe the results will be helpful in representing the views of WSU faculty and staff regarding Director performance.

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER

A Checklist of Recommendations

This checklist is intended to assist those who are responsible for or who will participate in the performance evaluations of academic library directors. Its aim is to promote greater knowledge among those who participate in the director evaluation process, to foster both effectiveness and fairness in director evaluations, and to strengthen library leadership as part of the overall process of improving libraries.

THE ACADEMIC LIBRARY DIRECTOR TODAY

Today's academic library directors often hold positions of broad responsibility and high visibility within their institutions. They may be responsible for information systems beyond the walls of the library: education and outreach programs; archives, museums, and galleries; and computing and telecommunications operations of vast proportions. Virtually everyone on campus uses or benefits from the library and its allied operations.

Clearly, the director's leadership is a key factor in the success or failure of the library. Directors have leadership responsibility for envisioning the future of their organizations and setting goals to achieve that future, choosing and leading the best possible staff, managing resources wisely, fund raising, seeing that exciting new programs get implemented, and assuring that the technology is there to support those programs. Because libraries are a critical aspect of the educational process, designing and maintaining systems for evaluating the performance of library directors is now more important today than ever before.

Ideally, participants in the director review process should be well informed about what library directors do and what should be expected of the director. More important, participants need to be aware of the director's goals and expectations as well as her or his accomplishments during the period of review. Participants should also work to make sure that the evaluation process is one that will promote the growth and development of the director and the improvement of library services and collections.

KEY LEADERSHIP ROLES

In order to assess the library director's performance, the variety of her or his leadership roles should be considered. Though the director delegates portions of these responsibilities to others, she or he has leadership responsibility for effectiveness in these areas. It is important to consider which roles are most relevant to the successful performance of the library's director. For some institutions, there may be other roles that should be added to this list.

1. CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE AND SPOKESPERSON. Directors act as the chief external representatives of their libraries; they present and explain the library to others; they distribute information to people (especially influential stakeholders) outside the library; they inform outsiders of progress within the library; and they promote the library to external constituents.

2. CAMPUS ADMINISTRATOR. Directors actively participate in the governance of the university or college through membership on committees, standing administrative groups, and task forces; they help develop policy on information issues, but also serve the larger community in tasks that may have little or no direct bearing on the library or on information policy; and they may administer—or partner with others who administer—operations outside the library (e.g., information technology).

3. LIAISON. Directors maintain contacts outside the library with key stakeholders in the parent institution (e.g., faculty and other constituent groups, advisory groups, other administrators), as well as with stakeholders outside the parent institution (e.g., community advisory and advocacy groups); they build external information networks; they serve as a significant contact point for those who wish to influence the library's goals; and they attempt through interactions with outside organizations to influence the environment in ways that are beneficial to the library (e.g., legislation).

4. MONITOR. Successful directors remain informed about critical developments in the external environment, including changes in how library users use the library and what users need in terms of information services; they are aware of current developments in other libraries and in the library profession; they use that knowledge to solve problems and to develop new services; and they educate the parent institution and the internal organization about information and communication technology issues.

5. NEGOTIATOR AND ADVOCATE. Directors negotiate with organizations and individuals outside the library to secure funding, reach agreement on key issues, and safeguard the interests of the library.

6. FUND RAISER. Directors lead the effort to identify needs that cannot be adequately supported by the parent institution, set priorities, and garner external funding through grants, gifts, endowments, and other development activities.

7. LEADER OF PLANNING AND OPERATIONS. Directors lead members of the library organization in developing value systems, visions, and goals for the library; they promote high-quality services by involving library staff appropriately in planning and decision making; they assure that there are performance measures and accountability systems and hold staff to them; they seek to understand internal library issues, problems, and operations in sufficient depth to make informed decisions; and they plan, coordinate, and oversee major multi-year capital projects, as well as smaller facilities projects.

8. LEADER OF STAFF. Directors create and support a continuous learning environment within the library and encourage staff to actively participate in virtually all the leadership roles noted in this list; they monitor the human relations side of the operation, insuring high-quality hiring, placement, retention, training, motivation, performance evaluation, and reward systems; they practice "facilitational leadership," especially in leading a diverse work force; they handle conflicts and crises within the library; they take corrective actions when unexpected disturbances occur; and some directors may serve as deans with responsibility for librarians who have faculty appointments.

9. COMMUNICATOR. Directors share and distribute information within the library through staff meetings, personal contacts, and other means; they invite input from individuals and groups within the library, listen attentively to that input, and act on it for the good of the library and its users.

10. CHANGE AGENT AND ENTREPRENEUR. Directors introduce change within the library by identifying problems, recognizing and seizing opportunities, and implementing new systems and programs; they promote experimentation and risk taking within the library (e.g., through the application of new technologies and innovative uses of networks); and they encourage staff to develop entrepreneurial skills.

11. RESOURCE ALLOCATOR. Directors develop priorities for resource allocation and design the organizational structure to achieve those priorities; they allocate funds, time, staff, materials, and equipment to assure that the library is a successful one; and they authorize major resource-related decisions made within the library.

This list of leadership roles is based on the work of Henry Mintzberg (*The Structuring of Organizations*, 1979) and Michael Ann Moskowitz ("The Managerial Roles of Academic Library Directors: The Mintzberg Model," Sept. 1986).

CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS

The checklist is divided into three general areas: review process guidelines, review process criteria, and review process participants. There are at least two important uses of the checklist: 1) as a framework for discussion between the directors and those who are responsible for evaluating them; and 2) as a tool for educating those who participate in the director's review. Although this list is not meant to be conclusive or restrictive, it presents important questions that should be addressed during the performance evaluation process.

I. REVIEW PROCESS GUIDELINES

A. Is there a formal process for performance review of the library director, or are there other effective means for monitoring her or his performance and providing feedback?

B. Are there documented procedural guidelines for the review process? If not, are the ad hoc guidelines mutually satisfactory to both the director and her or his supervisor?

C. Does the review have a clear purpose? Is it:

- a *decision tool* (used to decide whether the director will be reappointed or given a salary adjustment);
- a *developmental tool* (used to assist the director in performance improvement);
- a *communication tool* (used to share information about campus and library goals, problems, etc.);
- or any combination of the above?

D. Is the frequency of the review satisfactory to key participants in the process?

E. Does the process result in specific, candid feedback that is behavioral and recognizable and that will help the director build on performance strengths and work on performance weaknesses?

F. Are discussions of institutional and library priorities, goals, and objectives between director and participants part of the review process?

G. Is there an opportunity for the director to provide documentation or context, which may include planning goals, accomplishments, constraints, and other contextual information that will help participants in the review to make informed judgments?

II. REVIEW PROCESS CRITERIA

A. Are there documented criteria for the review that specifically refer to the director's position and responsibilities? Alternatively, are there generic criteria that are customized as part of the review process?

B. A principal measure of the director's performance is her or his success in achieving negotiated expectations as documented in library and institutional planning documents. Are the expectations clearly outlined and understood by participants? Does the review initiator provide an overall context for the review participants, especially regarding factors outside the director's control (e.g., a campus-mandated budget cut)?

C. Are the changing and evolving roles of many directors (e.g., fund raising) sufficiently recognized in the review process?

D. Is there a distinction between the performance of the library and the performance of its director? It should be clear to those involved in the process which aspects of the library's performance might be attributable to the director's leadership and which might not.

III. Review Process Participants

A. Is there an opportunity for a variety of participants to have input into the performance review process, which may include library staff, library users, institutional stakeholders with whom the director works, and external persons with knowledge of the director's work?

B. Is the input of those who know the director's performance first-hand given more weight than others? If anonymous input is offered, is it evaluated as such?

C. Does the review committee include another administrator comparable to the director who can provide assistance to the group during the process?

D. Is the director's supervisor actively involved in the process even though she or he might not be the review initiator? Does the supervisor give direct feedback to the director and provide participants with contextual information that will help them evaluate the director's performance?

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER

SELECTED READINGS

Association of Research Libraries. Office of Management Services. *Executive Review in ARL Libraries*. SPEC Kit #72. Washington, D.C., 1980.

Euster Joanne. *The Academic Library Director: Management Activities and Effectiveness*. Greenwood Press, 1987.

Mintzberg, Henry. *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of Research*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

McAnally, Arthur M., and Robert B. Downs. "The Changing Role of Directors in University Libraries." *College and Research Libraries* 34.2 (Mar. 1973): 103-25.

Moskowitz, Michael Ann. "The Managerial Roles of Academic Library Directors: The Mintzberg Model." *College and Research Libraries* 47 (Sept. 1986): 452-59.

Rooks, Dana C. "Terms for Academic Library Directors: Current Validity of the 1973 McAnally and Downs Findings." *Library Trends* 43 (Summer 1994): 47-61.

University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston. *Reviews of Administrators*. Online. Available: <http://www.uth.tmc.edu/ut_general/admin_fin/ planning/pub/hoop/intro/ intro_10.html>. 9 April 1998.

Woodsworth, Anne. "Getting Off the Library Merry-Go-Round." *Library Journal* 114 (May 1989): 35-8.

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER

Send prepaid orders to:
ARL Publications
Department #0692
Washington, DC 20073-0692

ORDER FORM

For more information contact:
ARL Publications Department
(202) 296-2296; fax (202) 872-0884
<pubs@arl.org>

QTY	TITLE		QTY	TITLE		QTY	TITLE	
				SP180	Flexible Work Arrangemts		SP130	Retrospective Conversion
	SP229	Evaluating Acad Libr Dirs		SP179	Access Services Org & Mgt		SP129	Organization Charts
	SP228	Preserving Digital Info		SP178	Insuring Lib Colls & Bldgs		SP128	Systems File Organization
	SP227	Organ of Doc Coll & Svcs		SP177	Salary Setting Policies		SP127	Interlibrary Loan
	SP226	After the User Survey		SP176	Svcs for Persons w/Disabilities		SP126	Automated Lib Systems
	SP225	Partnerships Program		SP175	Scholarly Info Centrs		SP125	Tech Svcs Cost Studies
	SP224	Staff Training & Development		SP174	Expert Systems		SP124	Barcoding of Collections
	SP223	TL 3: Electronic Scholarly Pubn.		SP173	Staff Recognition Awards		SP123	Microcomp Software Policies
	SP222	Electronic Resource Sharing		SP172	Information Desks		SP122	End-User Search Svcs
	SP221	Evol. & Status of Approval Plans		SP171	Training of Tech Svc Staff		SP121	Bibliographic Instruction
	SP220	Internet Training		SP170	Organization Charts		SP120	Exhibits
	SP219	TL 2: Geographic Info Systems		SP169	Mgt of CD-ROM		SP119	Catalog Maintenance Online
	SP218	Info Technology Policies		SP168	Student Employment		SP118	Unionization
	SP217	TL 1: Electronic Reserves		SP167	Minority Recruitment		SP117	Gifts & Exchange Function
	SP216	Role of Libs in Distance Ed		SP166	Materials Budgets		SP116	Organizing for Preservation
	SP215	Reorg & Restructuring		SP165	Cultural Diversity		SP115	Photocopy Services
	SP214	Digit Tech for Preservation		SP164	Remote Storage		SP114	Binding Operations
	SP213	Tech Svcs Workstations		SP163	Affirmative Action		SP113	Preservation Education
	SP212	Non-Librarian Professionals		SP162	Audiovisual Policies		SP112	Reorg of Tech and Pub Svcs
	SP211	Library Systems Office Org		SP161	Travel Policies		SP111	Cooperative Collection Dev
	SP210	Strategic Planning		SP160	Preservation Org & Staff		SP110	Local Cataloging Policies
	SP209	Library Photocopy Operations		SP159	Admin of Lib Computer Files		SP109	Staff Training for Automation
	SP208	Effective Library Signage		SP158	Strategic Plans		SP108	Strategic Planning
	SP207	Organ of Collection Develop		SP157	Fee-based Services		SP107	University Archives
	SP206	Faculty Organizations		SP156	Automating Authority Control		SP106	Electronic Mail
	SP205	User Surveys in ARL Libs		SP155	Visiting Scholars/Access		SP105	Nonbibliographic Dbases
	SP204	Uses of Doc Delivery Svcs		SP154	Online Biblic Search		SP104	Microcomputers
	SP203	Reference Svc Policies		SP153	Use of Mgt Statistics		SP103	Asst/Assoc Dir Position
	SP202	E-journals/Issues & Trends		SP152	Brittle Books Program		SP102	Copyright Policies
	SP201	E-journals/Pol & Proced		SP151	Qualitative Collect Analysis		SP101	User Studies
	SP200	2001: A Space Reality		SP150	Bldg Security & Personal Safety		SP100	Collection Security
	SP199	Video Collect & Multimedia		SP149	Electronic Mail		SP099	Branch Libraries
	SP198	Automating Preserv Mgt		SP148	User Surveys		SP098	Telecommunications
	SP197	Benefits/Professional Staff		SP147	Serials Control/Deselection		SP097	Building Renovation
	SP196	Quality Improve Programs		SP146	Lib Dev Fund Raising Capabilit		SP096	Online Catalogs
	SP195	Co-op Strategies in Foreign Acqs		SP145	Lib Publications Programs		SP095	Lib Materials Cost Studies
	SP194	Librarian Job Descriptions		SP144	Building Use Policies		SP094	Fund Raising
	SP193	Lib Develop & Fundraising		SP143	Search Proced Sr LibAdmin		SP093	User Instructions for Online Cats
	SP192	Unpub Matls/Libs, Fair Use		SP142	Remote Access Online Cats		SP092	Interlibrary Loan
	SP191	Prov Pub Svcs Remote User		SP141	Approval Plans		SP091	Student Assistants
	SP190	Chang Role of Book Repair		SP140	Performance Appraisal		SP090	Integrated Lib Info Systems
	SP189	Liaison Svcs in ARL Libs		SP139	Performance Eval: Ref Svcs		SP089	Tech Svcs Cost Studies
	SP188	Intern, Residency & Fellow		SP138	University Copyright		SP088	Corporate Use of Research Libs
	SP187	ILL Trends/Staff & Organ		SP137	Perservation Guidelines		SP087	Collect Descript/Assessment
	SP186	Virtual Library		SP136	Managing Copy Cataloging		SP086	Professional Development
	SP185	System Migration		SP135	Job Analysis		SP085	Personnel Classification Sys
	SP184	ILL Trends/Access		SP134	Planning Mgt Statistics		SP084	Public Svcs Goals & Objectvs
	SP183	Provision of Comp Print Cap		SP133	Opt Disks: Storage & Access		SP083	Approval Plans
	SP182	Academic Status for Libns		SP132	Library-Scholar Communication		SP082	Document Delivery Systems
	SP181	Perf Appr of Collect Dev Libn		SP131	Coll Dev Organization		SP081	Services to the Disabled

QTY	TITLE		QTY	TITLE		QTY	TITLE	
____	SP080	Specialty Positions	____	SP053	Performance Appraisal	____	SP026	Bibliographic Access
____	SP079	Internships/Job Exchanges	____	SP052	Cost Studies & Fiscal Plan	____	SP025	User Statistics and Studies
____	SP078	Recruitment-Selection	____	SP051	Professional Development	____	SP024	User Surveys
____	SP077	Use of Small Computers	____	SP050	Fringe Benefits	____	SP023	Grievance Policies
____	SP076	Online Biblio Search Svcs	____	SP049	Use of Annual Reports	____	SP022	Private Foundations
____	SP075	Staff Development	____	SP048	External Fund Raising	____	SP021	Paraprofessionals
____	SP074	Fees for Services	____	SP047	Automated Cataloging	____	SP020	Managerial Technical Specialists
____	SP073	External User Services	____	SP046	Plan Future of Card Catalog	____	SP019	Staff Allocations
____	SP072	Executive Review	____	SP045	Changing Role Personnel Officer	____	SP018	Staff Development
____	SP071	User Surveys: Eval of Lib Svcs	____	SP044	Automated Acquisitions	____	SP017	Library Instruction
____	SP070	Preservation Procedures	____	SP043	Automated Circulation Sys	____	SP016	Reclassification
____	SP069	Prep Emergencies/Disasters	____	SP042	Resource Sharing	____	SP015	Goals & Objectives
____	SP068	AACR2 Implement Studies	____	SP041	Collection Assessment	____	SP014	Performance Review
____	SP067	Affirm Action Programs	____	SP040	Skills Training	____	SP013	Planning Systems
____	SP066	Planning Preserv of Lib Materials	____	SP039	Remote Storage	____	SP012	Acquisition Policies
____	SP065	Retrospective Conversion	____	SP038	Collection Dev Policies	____	SP011	Collection Development
____	SP064	Indirect Cost Rates	____	SP037	Theft Detection & Prevent	____	SP010	Leave Policies
____	SP063	Collective Bargaining	____	SP036	Allocation Materials Funds	____	SP009	Tenure Policies
____	SP062	Online Biblio Search Svcs	____	SP035	Preservation of Lib Materials	____	SP008	Collective Bargaining
____	SP061	Status of Librarians	____	SP034	Determin Indirect Cost Rate	____	SP007	Personnel Class Schemes
____	SP060	Lib Materials Cost Studies	____	SP033	Intergrat Nonprint Media	____	SP006	Friends of the Lib Organization
____	SP059	Microform Collections	____	SP032	Prep, Present Lib Budget	____	SP005	Performance Review
____	SP058	Goals & Objectives	____	SP031	Allocation of Resources	____	SP004	Affirmative Action
____	SP057	Special Collections	____	SP030	Support Staff, Student Assts	____	SP003	A Personnel Organization
____	SP056	External Communication	____	SP029	Systems Function	____	SP003	Status of Librarians
____	SP055	Internal Com/Staff & Superv Role	____	SP028	Gifts & Exchange Function	____	SP002	Personnel Survey (flyer only)
____	SP054	Internal Com/Policies & Proced	____	SP027	Physical Access	____	SP001	Organization Charts

SPEC Kits include the summary SPEC Flyer, the survey results, and the best representative supporting documentation in the form of policy statements, handbooks, manuals, cost studies, procedure statements, planning materials, issue summaries, and selected readings. SPEC Kits and Flyers can be ordered directly from ARL or through your library vendor or subscription agent. Information on this and other OLMS products and services can be found at <http://www.arl.org/spec/specdesc.html>.

PRICE INFORMATION (ISSN 0160-3582 Kits, ISSN 0160-3574 Flyers; prices good through 12/31/98)

SPEC Kits (10 issues; shipping included): $280 U.S. and Canada, $340 International; 25% discount for 2 or more subscriptions.

- o Please start my SPEC subscription with next issue.
- o Please send me the indicated 10 back issues as my subscription.

Individual SPEC Kits are available for $40 ($25 ARL members), plus $6 each for shipping and handling.

Individual issues of the Transforming Libraries subseries are available for $28, plus $6 each for shipping and handling.

SPEC Flyer Subscription (10 issues/year; shipping included): $50 U.S. and Canada; $65 International.

PAYMENT INFORMATION

Orders must be prepaid; ARL members may be billed. Make check or money order payable in U.S. funds to the **ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES**, Federal ID #52-0784198-N.

Purchase Order # .....

Credit Card: ..... MasterCard ..... Visa Exp date .....

Account # .....

Account holder .....

Signature .....

TOTAL SHIPPING $ ..... **TOTAL PRICE** $ .....

SHIP TO

Name .....

Institution .....

Address (UPS will not deliver to P.O. boxes)

.....

.....

Phone .....

Fax .....

Email .....

SHIPPING & HANDLING

U.S. and Canada:

Sent via UPS Ground, $6 per publication.

International, Bulk, and Rush Orders:

Call (202) 296-2296 or email <pubs@arl.org> for quote.